

TIFFANY'S MONTHLY.

DEVOTED TO THE

INVESTIGATION OF SPIRITUAL SCIENCE.

JOEL TIFFANY

EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

VOLUME II.

NEW YORK:

JOEL TIFFANY, No. 6 FOURTH AVENUE.

1856.

BX5
· VT5

BR
1

T65
v. 2

CONTENTS OF VOL. II.

TIFFANY'S MONTHLY.

PAGE.		PAGE.	
The Higher Law.....	1	Justice Considered.....	289
Interior Life and Action.....	16	Propositions	304
Propositions	31	Coacoochee's Salk.....	305
Life of Christ.....	32	Propositions	308
Behman's Idea of God.....	49	What is the use of these Manifesta-	
Despotism of Human Governments	50	tions ?.....	309
Phenomena of Clairvoyance.....	68	Propositions	329
Propositions	85	Effects of Land Monopoly upon	
Prophecies of Nostradamus.....	86	Labor	330
Progress of Religious Liberty.....	90	Proposition	346
Propositions	92	Crime ; its Nature and Practice...	348
Buchanan's Anthropology.....	93	Human Standard of Perfection....	363
Worship.....	97	Propositions	369
Falsity of Bible Morality according		A word to the Laboring Classes...	370
to Orthodoxy	114	I am the Way.....	379
The Resurrection of the Body.....	127	Clairvoyance	385
Philosophy of Sympathy.....	142	The Reconciliation of Mankind thro'	
Propositions	159	Mediation	403
Plea for Christianity.....	160	Proposition	408
Different Spheres of Existence and		Cause of Crime and its Remedy...	409
Perception.....	175	A Dream of Flowers. (Poetry.)..	423
Presentiment	185	An Analysis of Man	427
Necessity for Continued Inspiration.....	193	Christianity a System of Discipline	443
A Plea for Christianity.....	215	Extraordinary Delusion.....	463
Christ a Condition, not an Individual.....	229	Review of Dr. Gordon's Three-fold	
Propositions	235	Test of Spiritualism.....	467
		How the Mind Acts.....	477
		The Position of the Ages.....	481

	PAGE.		PAGE.
Consequences of Government Interference with Individual Sovereignty.....	236	Simplicity	492
Propositions	253	Abstract Truths and Objective Realities	493
The Second Sphere of Knowledge and Mind.....	254	Whence must come Reform.....	500
Third Sphere of Wisdom and Mind	260	Who will be Holy.....	514
Man's Connection with the Sphere of Wisdom.....	262	Philosophy and Religion.....	531
Second & Third Spheres of Knowledge and Mind.....	268	Living Faith.....	538
Propositions	277	Free Agency and God's Foreordination.....	553
Spiritual Phenomena.....	278	God is the Father of Men.....	559
Propositions	287	Self-Accusation	560
A Short Sermon.....	288	Seeking God. (Poetry.).....	563
		The Knowledge of Spirits and their Progress.....	564
		The Office of the Law.....	571

THE HIGHER LAW.

HISTORY is said to be philosophy teaching by example. The study of history is useful to teach the phenomena of law. Unless those events recorded in history are the product of certain fixed principles, it would be of no importance to us to become acquainted with them; for if they were casualties or chance happenings, we could never learn by study how to reproduce or how to avoid them. If the details of history are not sufficiently minute to enable us to trace the causes concerned in producing the events narrated, the study of it will be unprofitable, and we might as well study fiction, and treasure up in the mind fictitious events. The difference between true history and fiction is the difference between the philosophy of God and the philosophy of man; between truth and falsehood; between the substance and its shadow. There is no such thing as chance in the universe. Everything which takes place in the field of universal activity, and is known as an event, is the product of a principle or a combination of principles, which were just adapted, under the circumstances, to produce the precise event.

Every volume of history which has been written for the instruction of man, and the authority with which they have been received, attest the almost universal conviction that everything is under the dominion of law, which is fixed and immutable, and the operation of which can not be changed or suspended—that that which has been, under the same circumstances will be again, and so continue to be repeated forever. These laws are interwoven into the existence of the universe, and are as universal as it, and as indestructible too. These laws can not be violated; that is, they can not be prevented from working out their inevitable results. The result may be different from what we desire—

may cost us our lives; but nevertheless the law has not been violated. If a rifle ball has been discharged, either by accident or design, in the direction of your heart, with a force sufficient to carry it through it, it is as much performing its mission as though it were passing through the heart of a lion or a tree. The ball would no sooner deviate to avoid your heart than it would to avoid a tree or a rock. The thistle's downy seed, which is seen pursuing its devious way through the air, is obeying a law as fixed and immutable as the earth in its orbit about the sun. If I throw a stone at a mark I may not hit it; but nevertheless the stone, under the projecting and resisting forces, will arrive at the precise point at which it was projected, although owing to my unskillfulness or carelessness it may be wide the mark.

The physician, in administering to his patient, may mistake his remedy and administer the wrong medicine, which will result in killing rather than curing his patient; but this mistake was the physician's, not the medicine's. It produced its legitimate and proper effect, although different from what the physician desired. Under the circumstances it could produce no other. It obeyed the laws of its existence and relation.

And thus it is in regard to all operations—we can not escape the dominion of law. There is a government over all existence which commands with omnipotent authority, and will be obeyed, and it reigns as triumphant in discord and confusion as in the most perfect harmony and order. That natural element which nourishes, develops and comforts me when I sustain a proper relation to it, will as readily curse and destroy me when I sustain an improper relation to it. Thus the fire which will warm me and cook my food and propel my machinery, and thus perform my labor, when I sustain to it a certain relation, will consume me, or my family, or property, when I sustain another relation to it; and the very law or principle which serves me in the one case destroys me in the other; and were it not for that principle it could neither bless nor curse me. The difference is not in the law, but in my relation to it.

A law or principle has reference to the mode of action or manifestation of certain existences. Thus the laws of the universe have reference to the mode of action or manifestation of the

various parts of the universe. The laws of gravitation have reference to the mode of the manifestation of that principle or existence; the laws of any piece of mechanism have reference to the action of the machinery; the laws of mind have reference to the action or mode of manifestation of mind, and the laws of society have reference to the action of society, etc. Now that only can be properly called law, which is an indispensable attribute or attendant of the thing to which it is applied, and is interwoven into the very existence of the thing to which it is applied. The law of a thing is inseparable from the thing itself. The laws of matter are inseparable from matter; the laws of organization are inseparable from organization; the laws of mind are inseparable from mind; and the laws of society are inseparable from society.

Nothing short of omnipotence can make or repeal a law. It is admitted that matter can be neither created nor destroyed, neither can the laws of matter be created nor destroyed. The law of a thing is as indestructible as the thing itself, and can only cease to exist when the thing of which it is the law ceases. As a law has reference to the mode of action or manifestation of an existence, it may combine with other principles, and appear in a combined or modified form. But nevertheless the law is seen in that very combination or modification, and is what produced it, and its power is as permanent in that combined or modified result, as when acting out its own simple force. Let the combination cease, and the law will again be seen asserting its original sway.

Thus, while we think we are impeding the operation of a law, we are only changing our own relation, or the relation of other things to it. We can not determine what shall be the effect of that change by any power we possess. We can only change the relation, and leave the laws to work out their own results in accordance with the change. The principles involved in mechanism consist only in availing ourselves of those principles or laws already in existence. We can only adapt our arrangements to those laws, and take the results they work out. If a principle is lacking, we can not supply it unless we by some means can draw

from the great storehouse of Nature. The most we can do is to adapt ourselves to that which already exists.

The inventor is a close student of Nature. His business is to adapt himself, in the simplest and most direct manner, to the government under which he lives; to call to his aid those laws which are interwoven into the very framework of the universe, and so arrange his plans as to bring the end he seeks to accomplish within the range of those laws; and by so doing he comes into harmony with them, and reaps the reward of being in harmony with the government in that respect. The individual who erects his windmill can not cause the wind to turn his machinery. He can only put himself in its range, and then let it blow or not as other things shall determine. He has no power to give momentum to the air. That comes from a higher power than that which fashioned the windmill. So with every other department in mechanical philosophy.

So also with every department in nature, we can only arrange and fashion, not create or enact. He only can enact a law who has power to create the thing or object of which it is the law; and whoever disregards the laws already in existence, and attempts the work of enacting on his own authority, will find himself involved in the ruin which his own madness and folly will inevitably bring upon him. He may thrust his hand into the fire, and resolve not to be burned; and he may call to his aid all the legislative enactments of all the governments on earth, to the same effect, and he will find there is a law which will burn him in spite of them all. He will find there is a higher law than that of human enactment. He may thrust his head beneath the water, and resolve not to drown. But he will find that no human authority can save him from drowning with changing his relation to the water. He may take a deadly dose of poison into his stomach, and call upon the legislature to keep him from being poisoned. But he will find the higher law will prevail in spite of legislative enactment.

What is true in relation to the higher law as applicable to inert matter or to living organisms is equally true as applicable to mind. It has its laws of action and manifestation incorporated into its very existence, and those laws are imperative, and will

be obeyed either in developing and unfolding it, or in depressing and crushing it; and those laws can not be changed or repealed. They will work out their results upon the individual, according to the relation into which he puts himself. All the legislation of the world can not aid him or injure him any farther than it may affect his relation to them, and then their aid or injury was indirect, and affected the individual and not the law. The individual was saved or crushed by the higher law.

The same is also true of society: Being composed of individuals, each under the dominion of the higher law, they can not be absolved from that dominion. No declaration of independence can free them from its omnipotent authority. That government can not be thrown off, because there is no power to resist its commands. Men can control their relations to one another, but they can not control the law incident to those relations. They can not control the results which will inevitably flow from those relations. When they elect to take certain relations, and do take them, they must take the consequences *per force*; they can have no election in that matter.

Man being under the control of the higher law, and being subject to it by the very constitution of his being, must be left at liberty to obey it. Obey it he can. Submit to it he must. By obeying it, I mean he can place his highest good in the range of its action, and he is at liberty to do so, and no authority which can not shield him from its operation can compel him to act otherwise. If any man or body of men demand of me that I place myself in a position adverse to the proper operation of these higher laws upon my highest good and destiny, I have a right to demand of them immunity before I will obey their demand; and if they can not give me that immunity, they have no claim upon my obedience. They may bring their brute force to bear upon me, the same as can the robber or the assassin, and they would wrong me in doing so no less than would the robber or the assassin.

The conclusion then is, that human governments can not enact laws, any more than they can create the beings who are the subjects of those laws. The power to enact a law necessarily implies the power to create that to which the law is applied, and

the law thus enacted becomes a part and parcel of the thing or being to which it is applied. As everything which exists is subject to the government of that which gave it existence, and can not escape the mandates of that government, so every sentient being that exists is at liberty to obey the mandates of that government; and as the nature of that government is such that the highest good and destiny of every intelligent being can be made to harmonize with its operations, every intelligent being has an inalienable right thus to arrange its relations to it so as to harmonize; and no human power has any right to come between man and that higher government, until it can give perfect immunity against the operations of its laws.

Human legislation, then, is of no binding authority when it conflicts with the laws of this higher government; and it can impose no obligation on man to obey such enactments, because it not only can not protect him in such obedience, but must itself perish in obeying its own false enactments. And when human governments attempt to enforce such edicts by fine, imprisonment or death, they act by virtue of brute force, and are obnoxious to the charge of robbery, oppression and murder; and when human governments enact laws in accordance with the higher laws, those laws are of no more binding obligation on man than though human legislation was averse to them. There is and can be no law to which man is subject, which can derive any additional authority from human legislation, nor is there any law to which man is subject, whose authority can be weakened by human legislation. Human legislation may attempt to control man's relations to this government, and place him in harmony or in antagonism to it; but after it has done that, it has done all it can do. Its power is thus at an end. Hence, said Christ, "Fear not them who have power over the body only, and after that have no more that they can do; but fear him, fear that government, which does not end there, but has power over the soul, over the eternal well-being of the individual; meaning that we are to disobey all human laws when obedience to them would cause us to disobey the higher, the divine law.

If human governments have a right to claim the obedience of man when they contravene the higher or the divine law, from

whence do they derive that authority? From God? Has he authorized any man or set of men to contemn his authority, or to command me to contemn it? If he has delegated such authority, why does he punish me or permit me to be punished, for thus disobeying him, for thus violating the higher law of my being? Has the Almighty become a *particeps criminis*, and adopted into his government that human enactment which sets his laws at defiance, and disturbs the harmony and order of his government? If he has given to human legislators the right to command me to violate his laws, and the laws of my highest being and destiny, he is divided against himself, and his government can not stand. But his government does stand, and sweeps on with irresistible power in defiance of all human enactments, and it crushes me unless I come into harmony with it. Therefore I very properly infer that he has delegated no such authority. Have they derived that authority from man? He has no such authority to delegate. No man or number of men can command, much less authorize me to violate the laws of God. I am not responsible to man in any such sort. When human governments can stand between me and God, when they can shield me from the operations of his laws, then will I talk with them about the expediency of disobeying the higher law to obey that which is no law, and not till then, and away with all your devils in the shape of priests or politicians who would tempt me to do otherwise.

But again: If human governments have a right to command me to obey their enactments in violation of the higher laws, is there no limit to that authority? If there is, where is that limit to be found? How far must I follow in my obedience to these false and wicked enactments, before I am authorized to stop and put myself under the protection of the higher law? At what point can I stand forth as a citizen of the divine government, and speak with the dignity of my God-given sovereignty, and speak thus far, and no farther? Let those who demand of me obedience to human enactments, give me some test by which I may know that human authority is at an end. Let them give me the distinct boundaries of the divine and human governments. Until they shall do this, I shall claim the authority of exercising

my own sovereign judgment, taking the responsibilities upon my own head; and when the question comes to obey their enactments or violate the laws of the divine, I shall not be long in determining which I shall obey. I shall bow before that authority under whose government I must remain after these human establishments have perished in their own madness and folly. They may fine, they may imprison, they may decapitate or gibbet this carcass, I am a coward and deserve no better fate, if I would not laugh their prisons or gibbets to scorn.

Man is under no allegiance to a wicked or oppressive government. He is bound to condemn and despise it, and reject its authority, and he is to be sole judge, and he must take upon his own head the consequences. If the laws he refuses to obey are in antagonism to the laws of the divine government, he does well in disobeying them, let come what may; if the laws he refuses to obey are in harmony with the divine government, he does ill to disobey them.

There can be no apology offered for disobeying the higher law for the sake of conforming to human enactments, and whoever will do it is a coward and a traitor to God and humanity, and fit to be a slave here, if not to be damned hereafter. The only way the rights of man can be vindicated, is to stand by them at all hazards, and the greater the peril, the greater the necessity to meet the danger. Let it become the universal doctrine that men will not submit to be robbed of their rights, to be enslaved—that they will not be whipped into tame submission to wrong and oppression. Let it be universally understood that a man can be robbed of his rights only with his life, and there would be infinitely less robbing. The man who will tamely acquiesce in being made a slave, does as great a wrong to his fellow-man as the man who makes him such.

Is it claimed that human governments can not be maintained unless the subject is bound to submit to all enactments, be they right or wrong, be they in harmony with, or in antagonism to, the divine government? Let them cease then; for the rights of man can not be maintained unless men have the right to vindicate them under all circumstances. It is the very climax of nonsense and absurdity to claim in one breath that man has certain

inalienable rights, and in the next that government can deprive him of them, and thus make it wrong for him to claim that which is unalienably his own? How are such contradictions to be reconciled? By what authority did our forefathers resist the enactments of Great Britain? Had they any proper authority to resist, aside from their inalienable rights as men? Were they bound to submit tamely to the oppressive enactments of Great Britain? Did their right to assert and maintain their rights depend upon their numbers or their strength? If so, what number must be crushed beneath the oppressions of government before man can be permitted to stand forth in the sovereignty of his humanity, and denounce the authority of his oppressor? Does man's allegiance to the divine government depend upon the character of the human government under which he lives? Are men's obligations to obey the divine law dependent upon the conditions whether they harmonize with human edicts or enactments? Upon their own doctrines, man's obligation to obey the government under which he lives is based upon the protection which that government affords him. If the government gives him no protection, it is not entitled to his obedience. But human governments can afford no protection against the penalties of the divine; hence it can put man under no obligation to obey its mandates when they conflict with the divine.

The rights of man are superior to all human institutions. Man is above all human institutions. The authority of governments must yield before the authority of man, as the creature must yield before the authority of the Creator. The highest authority under God is the authority of the individual created in the image of God. The highest sovereignty under God is the sovereignty of that God-created image. He is and can be subject to no law but that of the Divine, because there are no laws but the divine. All of men's rights harmonize with, and are sanctioned by, the divine laws, and man has divine and sovereign authority to assert and vindicate those rights, and when he does so, he speaks and acts by the authority of God, and there is no authority vested in earth or heaven to oppose him, and whoever or whatever opposes him does so wrongfully, and without authority.

When the individual claims that which under the divine law is not his; when he sets up claims to rights which appertain not to him, he does so in his own wrong, and without authority, and all the governments of earth may unite to sanction his false claim; they can not add one iota to his authority. If he robs or murders by the authority of all the governments in the world, he is an individual robber and murderer still, and all the consolation he is entitled to from the reflection that he has done it by the pretended authority of human governments is, that he is not the only robber or murderer—that he is not alone in his guilt, although as guilty as if alone.

The hypothesis that human enactments can make wrong right, is at war with every principle of justice and sound morality. It erects a false standard of morals, and does more to corrupt and debase man, than almost any other hypothesis man can assume. You can witness its corrupting and debasing influence in the operation of our courts of justice, as they are falsely called. You can scarcely walk the streets without witnessing the operation of robbing by law. If by any legal technicality I can avail myself of my neighbor's hard earnings, without rendering him any equivalent whatever, the law takes hold, and by force turns him and his family, beggared and penniless, into the streets, and puts me into his place; and I justify myself because it has been done according to law, and the community who look to human enactments as the highest authority and the highest standard of morality justify me, and stand ready to do the same by me as soon as the law affords them an opportunity.

Those who claim that human enactments which violate the demands of justice and fair dealing must be obeyed, inculcate and sustain this kind of morality in community. Their influence is to educate men to become legal robbers and swindlers, and to justify them in their robbery and swindling; and he who will thus avail himself of such advantages, is before God and just men as corrupt as the thief, the robber or the assassin, and before the tribunal where the higher law prevails must be adjudged as such. Before that tribunal the law takes notice of the *matter*, rather than the *manner*, of doing wrong. "There the action must be met in its true nature; "no shuffling or special pleading;

while before human tribunals their enactments have reference to to the *manner* of doing the wrong; and if it is done in legal form, no matter how base, dishonest or unjust, it is "sanctioned and sanctified."

Thus everything in existence is under the dominion of a government which is over all, and which will not yield its authority until it yields its existence; and it is upon the stability and eternity of that government that the order and harmony of the universe, and the highest good and destiny of man, depend. It was planned by Omniscience, begotten in love, and executed by Omnipotence, and cannot fail to accomplish its end. Every principle or law of its action is the consummation of love, wisdom and power. Its beauty and harmony are seen in the movements of the heavenly bodies. There Omniscience and Omnipotence combine to display the perfection of these higher laws. The relations of those bodies can only change in obedience to their legal mandates. There is no confusion, no disorder, no antagonism. Each orb silently and passively obeys its highest impulse, and can not go astray. But how soon would the harmony and beauty of the celestial system be destroyed, if those orbs were subject to the legislative control of man! The moon would be thrown upon the earth, and both together would go staggering into the sun. The equilibrium of the system would be destroyed, and the same law which now begets harmony and order, and is a perpetual anthem of praise to its author, would become the fell destroyer, would become the author of discord, antagonism and destruction.

And what is true of the operation of the higher law as applicable to worlds, suns and systems, is true of its operations in the minutest details of existence. Let its mandates be obeyed throughout every department of universal existence; that is, let everything come into harmony of relation, and the same order and harmony and beauty would be manifested in the one department as in the other. Man, created in the image of his Maker, and the most perfect of all his works, would stand forth in the true dignity of his nature, and would reflect the wisdom and goodness and power of his Infinite Father. And this condition is yet to

be attained. Lost in ignorance, misguided by falsehood, impelled by conflicting impulses, he is in a false relation to this government and the action of these higher laws. Owing to this false relation, he is in a state of antagonism with the rights, interests and well-being of his fellow man, and he never can avoid this antagonism until he learns his relation to this supreme government which is over him, and until he brings himself into harmony with its laws. This he will learn when he understands the nature of his existence and destiny, when he understands the purpose for which he lives. He will then so arrange his relations to this higher government, as to bring the end of his being into the range of the action of these higher laws; he will assume a position parallel with their action, and no longer lay athwart them.

Every true reformer is laboring to bring man into true relation to this supreme government; he is endeavoring to demonstrate to man what true relation is. By so doing he comes into antagonism with man's false relations, and is denounced as endeavoring to upturn the foundations of society. He is proscribed as an enemy of God and man, as an infidel, an enthusiast, and a deceiver of the people. From the nature of his office, he can not be received otherwise. If his positions are not sufficiently bold and antagonistic to the false relations which now prevail, and are producing this discord and confusion in society, he is not sufficiently advanced to entitle him to the name or character of a reformer, and it is no matter whether he is believed or not.

One of the best tests of the truthfulness and value of any reform sought to be established, is to be found in the violence of the opposition it awakens in those who are sustaining this false relation to this higher government. The truthfulness of Christianity as taught and practiced by Jesus Christ, and the thoroughness and fidelity with which he taught them, are most conspicuously seen in his persecutions and death. The prison, the rack, the gibbet and the cross are the seals with which the world have ever attested to the genuineness of every reform and the fidelity of every reformer. If the boldness and fidelity of Paul at Ephesus had not endangered the craft of Demetrius, he would

never have thought of getting up a mob to destroy him. If he could have demonstrated his positions to be false, he would have gone into the school of Tyranus and debated with him.

It is the business of the true reformer to study the relation of man to this supreme government, in his physical, moral and social nature; to ascertain what that relation is, and to teach man how to come into that relation, and how to maintain it. Man's physical relation can be learned by studying his physical necessities, and ascertaining what is best suited to supply their demand. If he demands food, what kind and how much? If he demands drink, what kind and how much? If he demands clothing, what kind and how much? If he demands exercise, what kind and how much? He can study his moral and social relations by ascertaining what are his moral and social necessities; for they depend upon his relations to the divine government, and under its economy must be supplied. He will find that they demand, first, individuality, second, sovereignty, and lastly, justice or equity. Let man come into true relations with the divine government in each of these respects, and harmony will inevitably flow out into society, and every true reformer must embrace each of these latter particulars, if he would hope to redeem man and bring him into harmonious relations with himself, his fellow man and with God.

These positions must not be sacrificed upon any consideration. The personality of man must be developed; the sovereignty must be maintained, and exact justice must prevail. If human governments antagonize, they must be discarded, for they are in conflict with the divine; and while they would compel man to assume an antagonistic relation, they can not give him immunity.

As an immortal being individualizing for eternity, sowing a harvest which he must forever be reaping, man has a right to demand that which belongs to his own eternal well-being; he has a right to provide for his own personality here and hereafter; and no being has any right to demand of him the sacrifice of any portion of his personality for the personality of another. Were it in the nature of the divine government that the well-being of one must be sacrificed for the well-being of another, no power would have authority to demand of me that I make that sacrifice.

against my own free will and pleasure. Hence my sovereignty must not be infringed. I must be permitted to act my own free will and pleasure when that pleasure does not conflict with the sovereignty of my equal brother; but if in the exercise of my sovereignty I interfere with the equal rights and sovereignty of my brother, then justice steps in and tells me to stop.

As society is composed of individuals, each a subject of the divine government, and as such, each having equal rights, the laws of society under the divine government must be in harmony with the laws of the individual under the same government; and if personality and sovereignty and justice are not preserved to the individual under the arrangements of that society, it is in a false relation to the divine government, and must be changed; and just so far as it sustains that false relation, it can impose no obligation upon the individual.

The common doctrine that an individual must give up a portion of his natural rights, must sacrifice a portion of his sovereignty on coming into society, is false. He has no natural rights that he is at liberty to part with. He has no more than are absolutely indispensable to him to enable him to fulfill his destiny. God has given him no surplus, and will not allow him to barter any of them away, if he hopes to sustain just relations to the divine government. He gives up no right to appropriate the rights or property of another, for he never had any such right to give up. All the rights he possesses are subject to the demands of equal and exact justice. He possessed no right before he came into society, which could conflict with the claims of justice, and in society he possesses every right which does not thus conflict. Therefore, man gives up nothing on coming into society.

It is because man's natural rights are indispensable to him to enable him to fulfill his mission, and to sustain to the divine government a true and harmonious relation, that his rights are inalienable. Were they such as could be dispensed with, and leave the man a true and proper man still, qualified for the duties to be performed to fulfill his destiny, they might very properly be parted with, and hence would not be inalienable. But it is not so. God has given man no superfluous or useless rights; he has dealt with him as with the other works of his hands, endowed

him with everything essential to his existence and destiny, and nothing more; and whoever attempts to rob him of the endowments of God, attempts to thwart his destiny, and sins not only against man, but God. Therefore whatever of man's rights or of his sovereignty human governments seek to destroy, they so far are false to man and God, and by every principle of allegiance to God and faith to man, should be crushed, or as expressed in our ever-to-be-remembered Declaration of Independence, " Whenever a government evinces a design to disregard the ends of justice, and reduce her subjects under an absolute despotism, *it is their duty* to overthrow such government, and establish new guards for their future security.

Then write it down as a truth ever to be remembered and practiced upon, that man is under the dominion of higher laws than those of human enactment; that his present and eternal well-being demands that he should at all times and under all circumstances obey the mandates of that higher law; that no human authority can excuse him from obeying its mandates, or give him immunity from its penalties, and therefore no human authority can claim his obedience to those enactments which conflict with that higher law; that the requirements of the divine government harmonize with man's highest good and destiny, and will bless him if he will come into harmonious relations with that government, but the same power will curse him if he sustain inharmonious relations to it. Man has a right to be blessed by coming into such relationship, and to disregard, contemn and disobey all power or authority which would compel him to sustain any other than a just relationship to that government. And there is no other authority in heaven or on earth to command his obedience.

" Though we break our Father's promise, we have nobler duties first ;
 The traitor to humanity is the traitor most accursed ;
 Man is more than constitutions ; better rot beneath the sod,
 Than be true to Church and State while they are doubly false to God.

" We owe allegiance to the State ; but deeper, truer, more,
 To the sympathies that God hath set within our spirit's core ;
 Our country claims our fealty ; we grant it so, but then,
 Before man made us citizens, ' Th' Almighty made us men.' "

INTERIOR LIFE AND ACTION.

THAT act only properly belongs to man which is the expression of his inmost selfhood, by which I mean, man in his inmost is what his interior loves and delights express. When man acts from his inmost, he acts spontaneously, by virtue of the life and activity within; that is, he acts as God acts, from himself, and not from influences exterior to himself. If man in his inmost is not in harmony with the divine, it is not his fault. If, in his inmost element, he acts from his own uninduced volitions, which depend upon the constitution of his interior being for their existence, he must act according to the nature of that interior being, because the nature of that being will determine the nature of his spontaneous volitions. If the interior nature be divine, his spontaneity will be in harmony with the divine; if his interior nature be depraved, his spontaneity will antagonize with the divine; and man has as much power to *create* his original nature, as he has to change the spontaneity of that nature; for spontaneity being an element of his inmost constitution, is an appurtenant to it.

Hence man, in his inmost or interior selfhood, must exist in the perfect image of God, which image can no more be defaced than the soul can be annihilated—can no more be depraved than God can be corrupted. The interior is perfectly pure, just and true, and when it wills, speaks or acts, it does so in perfect harmony with everything which is pure, just and true. This interior is the celestial or divine principle in man; it is the life of his soul, the vivifying and animating power of the Spirit.

Such being the true nature of man's inmost selfhood, man interiorly is a divine being; and whenever the interior shall be so developed as to bring the exterior into a state of subjection to it—when its own spontaneous will shall dictate all the actions of the

man, then will there be an exhibition of the divine humanity. Then will man, in the whole round of his activity, give expression to the loves and delights of God, and will exhibit a model of perfect sanctification.

This interior or divine principle in man is perfect. By perfection is not meant either omniscience or omnipotence, but is meant that perfection which Christ exhibited in his life and teachings—perfection in its loves, its delights and desires. It is that kind of perfection which Christ enjoined upon his disciples when he said, "Be ye perfect as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." It is that kind of oneness or sameness with God for which he prayed when he desired "that they might become one in him as he was one with the Father."

Christ's perfections consisted not in his wisdom or power. He never claimed equality or oneness with the Father in those respects, but on the contrary claimed that his wisdom and power were derived. Whatever he did, he did not of himself; whatever he knew was from God, and he knew only as God revealed it to him. So is it with man's interior perfection; it consists not in his wisdom or power, but in his loves and delights. Wisdom and power are acquired or increased, while love or interior delight is incidental and constitutional.

This distinction is to be kept in mind. The inmost is essentially *love* or delight. Hence, in speaking of God in this character, he is denominated *Love*; that is, in his being he is *love*. Hence also, Christ claimed this sameness or likeness with God. Said he, "I and my Father are one;" that is, Christ claimed that in his inmost he was one with God. In all his loves and delights he was so in harmony with God that it was his meat and his drink to do the will of his Father. His inmost was so developed as to hold his exterior nature in entire subjection thereto, and hence he claimed for himself that he was "sanctified" in his humanity, and was most emphatically "the begotten of the Father," "the Son of God."

In accordance with this distinction to be made between *love* and *wisdom*, while Christ was one with the Father in his *Love*, he increased in knowledge and stature like other men, and in matters purely intellectual he was subject to being mistaken; that

is, had he attempted to arrive at truths by a process purely intellectual, he would have been liable to have committed errors, like other men. But so far as his knowledge was intuitional, or by divine influx, so far could his positions be relied on.

That class of truths which have reference to man's inmost in its state of being and relation, are more properly subject to intuition or influx; those truths which have reference to exterior forms of existence, action and relation, belong more properly to the intellectual or scientific world, and are not so much, if at all, subjects of intuition and influx. Hence Christ, from the high development of his inmost, was highly gifted in intuitional knowledge, and that obtained through influx, yet he exhibited no great intellectual power. He discoursed not upon the arts or sciences; he framed no logical or intellectual arguments; he spoke and acted from an interior perception of that which was pure, just and true; that is, he spoke and acted from the highest source of all knowledge—truth itself. He depended neither on analogy nor induction for his deductions, and hence was not liable to err, as those are who attempt to determine those higher and more interior forms of truth by such exterior processes.

This intuitional knowledge, or interior perception of truth, is the highest evidence man can have of any truth, and there is no truth belonging to man's inmost which can be fully revealed to man in any other way. Without this interior perception or intuitional knowledge of spiritual truths, or truths appertaining to man's inmost selfhood, no man can have any just conception of them, and all ideas obtained in any other way respecting God, Spirit, heaven or hell, will be gross, sensual and false. Hence it is that Christ's teachings have never been fully understood by any one, because no one has been sufficiently developed to interiorly perceive the full scope of the truths he taught.

Theological speculations and abstractions never can teach those truths as they teach scientific truths, because they are not capable of being taught by any such means. Reason, based upon observation, comparison and judgment, is good within its sphere. In the field of exterior observation and scientific demonstration, it is indispensable to guide the intellectual faculties, but is good for nothing out of that field, and can never be considered per-

fectly reliable within it. As the correctness of our reason must depend upon the accuracy of our knowledge of the existence and relation of things, reason can only be relied upon within the sphere of accurate knowledge. When we pass beyond that sphere, reason will halt and stumble. By analogy we sometimes attempt to push our reasons beyond the sphere of accurate knowledge, but when we do so we are liable to mistake our analogies, and hence make false deductions.

Reason is more applicable to man in his exterior relations through his exterior selfhood, and has to do with that exterior being. The intellectual faculties of man have more to do with man in his relations to nature and society, while intuitive knowledge, or the interior perceptions, have more to do with the inmost and with those truths appertaining to the inmost selfhood of man. Hence it is that reason, acting within its sphere, determines that man is a machine, controlled by the exterior circumstances or influences by which he is surrounded, while interior consciousness declares him to be as free as God in all his interior impulses and actions, each deciding correctly within its sphere.

Thus it is, all exterior or scientific truths fall within the sphere of intellect, and must come under the jurisdiction of reason. Man in his exterior selfhood belongs to this exterior universe, and is a scientific fact to be studied in the light of science, and judged of before the tribunal of reason. In his exterior selfhood man is in a state of interior subjectivity, and reason decides right when she determines that so much of man as is within the sphere of her observation is molded and influenced by circumstances. But when we come to interior or spiritual truths, reason is silent, and interior perception or innate consciousness speaks, and she speaks a higher truth, that man, in all his interior loves, impulses and actions, is as free as God.

This interior perception of truth is as much higher evidence than rational deduction, as knowledge is higher conviction than mere assent. From its nature it must be, because the truths it reveals are impressed or daguerreotyped upon the soul, and become interior realities; that is, as it were, a part of the soul itself. This difference between intellectual truths and spiritual

truths should never be lost sight of. If we would learn to make a proper and just distinction between the two classes of truths and allow each to be adjudicated before their proper tribunals, we should have less discussion and antagonism.

These two spheres of truth would harmonize if they were allowed to sustain true relations to each other. But it is the exterior that must come into true relations to the interior or celestial. The interior can never change its relations to harmonize with the exterior, because by so changing its relations, it would become discordant with all other celestials, and consequently would be repelled by the very laws which now attract it to all celestials and God.

Spiritual truths can not be appreciated through the intellectual faculties. They must be revealed to the mind by influx or interior perception. This position can not be too carefully attended to. Spiritual truths are not subject to the perceptions of those faculties which are necessarily used in the process of ratiocination. They can not be compared, analyzed and judged of in their interior signification. Until the soul can feel and know them, independent of all rational deduction, it can in reality know nothing of them. It may learn something of their exterior effects and relations, but it can know nothing of their interior fitness and signification.

These two classes of truths are adapted, the one to our exterior, the other to our interior selfhoods; the one class may be denominated exterior, and the other interior truths. These exterior truths may be denominated scientific truths, and are such as are perceived through the senses, aided by such rational deductions, as the intellectual faculties may make. A mind may be so constituted; that is, its interior and exterior relations may be such, that while it can perceive in a high degree exterior or scientific truths, it has very little perception of interior ones.

We often see exhibitions of this class of minds among the learned and scientific of the world. Men may have giant intellects, be able to investigate and comprehend scientific truths, to analyze, compare and judge with great strength and accuracy, and yet have little interior perception of truth, or intuitive knowl-

edge. Such minds are liable to be skeptical as to all spiritual truths, or they are liable to entertain the most silly and bigoted notions respecting them.

When we carefully investigate the distinction between intellect and intuition, and understand the proper sphere of each, we shall be able to correct many errors into which we have fallen by confounding them together. We shall also find that a large class of truths, or rather that the spirit of all truth, can only be communicated to the mind through intuition or influx. We shall find that no revelation can be made respecting spiritual truths which are addressed to the intellectual faculties of man. By intellectual faculties I mean those by means of which man analyzes, compares and judges. Unless a spiritual truth is so brought home to the mind that it feels its truth, its truthfulness is not perceived.

The interior or celestial principle in man, that is the God within, is not an intellectual or rational principle. It possesses not the faculty of comparing, reasoning or judging, and it has no respect or use for any such faculties. What it perceives or knows, it perceives and knows without the exercise of reason or judgment. It never compares one thing with another that it may act from choice—that it may judge between the two. Whenever it is developed or elevated to the sphere of any truth, and that truth is presented, it perceives and knows the truth at once, as it knows its own existence.

This interior perception of truth is superior to all knowledge obtained through the exercise of the intellectual or reasoning faculties. Its truths are of a higher order, and its knowledge of them is more perfect. This interior or celestial principle perceives truth within its sphere as God perceives them, and knows them as God knows them, because it is God within.

God is not an intellectual or rational Being. He has no use for the intellectual faculties. He has no causality, or comparison as faculties of the deific mind. He has no occasion to compare or judge, to reason or infer. The Divine essence, in its expansiveness filling immensity, and embracing within itself all truths, principles or causes, intuitively perceives all truths, principles, causes, etc., with all their relations, sequences and effects. Being

the inmost or interior of all things, the divine essence embraces all truths, etc., or in other words, all truths, etc., are emanations from the divine essence.

The intellectual faculties or reasoning powers of which man boasts so much, are not, strictly speaking, divine; that is, they belong not to the interior or celestial principle. They are the necessary attributes of the exterior man, and are as indispensable to the proper development of the exterior or rational man, as intuition, perception, or interior receptivity is to the interior man.

The intellectual faculties occupy a position midway between the sensuous and celestial. Let my terms be understood. By the sensuous I mean that order of mind belonging to the brute, depending upon sensation and instinct for its utmost scope of comprehension—that mind which can only take notice of the externals of material or sensible existences, but can not trace causes or principles separated from those external forms. By the intellectual I mean that power of the mind which can look beyond the material or sensible forms of existence, and can perceive the presence of invisible principles or causes—can, like a Newton, see in the falling apple the principle which moves worlds, suns and systems. But intellect, although it can trace in the falling apple the principle of universal gravitation, and by the exercise of its rational powers can detail or demonstrate the law by which it acts or is manifested, yet it can not perceive the principle in its essence, but only in its mode of manifestation or relation. There is that about gravitation the intellectual faculties can not fathom, and that is the essence of the thing itself; but there is that in man which in its constitution is adapted to perceiving that essence, and when that celestial principle shall be developed to the sphere of that truth, it will perceive it, and appreciate it.

Thus it is, sensation reveals the externals of *material* existences, but does not reveal the principles concerned in giving these external forms. Intellect reveals the principles in their modes of action and manifestation, but not in their essence or interior nature, while intuition or innate perception reveals them in their interior qualities. Thus it will be perceived that intuition or *influx* is the highest degree of knowledge of the highest forms of

truth. Therefore, when I say God is not an intellectual or rational being, I say it in a sense not derogatory to the most perfect and complete wisdom; I say it because God is superior to or above, intellect and reason.

Hence man, in his inmost or celestial principle, being in the image of God, or in the element of his inmost being God, is not an intellectual or rational being, because he is superior to intellect or reason. His intuitional knowledge within the sphere of his interior development, is perfect. As his interior or inmost develops to the sphere of any interior truth, and thus becomes receptive of it, that truth will flow in, and man will have the highest possible knowledge of such truth.

This difference between intellectual and intuitional knowledge is most beautifully exemplified in the life and teachings of Jesus Christ. As has before been intimated, he was not an intellectual but an intuitional being. In his dispute with the doctors when he was but twelve years of age, the pertinency of his questions and the wisdom of his answers depended not upon the exercise of his intellectual faculties or reasoning powers, but upon his interior perceptions or intuitive knowledge. He had no occasion to consult authorities or read books to obtain that wisdom which was from above. He had no occasion to study history, or philosophy, or rhetoric or logic, or any thing of that sort. His interior was so developed that he could intuitively perceive the highest forms of truth in their interior essence and relation, without deducing them from their interior modes of action and manifestation. When they told him that God had authorized them through Moses to do certain strange things, he at once perceived that it was not so, and forbade the taking of "an eye for an eye, or a tooth for a tooth."

For this reason, while Christ exhibited the highest and most perfectly developed mind of which history makes any mention, he showed no traces of the scholar. There was no striking manifestation of intellectual power. He entered upon no logical argument; he made no rational deductions. When he spoke, he spoke with authority and decision. Hence the expression of his biographer, "The people were astonished at his sayings, for he taught them as one having authority, and not as the Scribea."

He had no use for reason or intellect, for he was superior to both, and he was teaching a class of truths that the intellectual faculties could not appreciate—truths or principles that must be *intuitively* perceived, if perceived at all. Hence Christ's wisdom consisted not in mathematical, philosophical or historical knowledge; his mental development consisted not in the exercise of any of the intellectual faculties, so called; but in the expansion of the interior selfhood, the God within, which perceives truths in their highest form and signification, by the image they stamp upon that selfhood.

With these lower or historical and scientific truths he had nothing to do, except so far as they might be useful to illustrate the inmost truths he wished to teach, and all truths of that kind which were essential for illustration were revealed to him by divine influx. He had no occasion to study them and reason upon them; for when they were revealed they came unsought, and found a spontaneous expression at the proper time and in a proper manner. Hence he charged his disciples, whenever they were arrested and brought before their accusers, to take no thought what they were to say in their defense, for it would be given them in that hour what to say. This he had found to be true from his own experience. It was only necessary to cultivate a quiet, passive frame of mind, so that it would be ready at all times to receive impressions by divine influx.

The philosophy of this requisition can be appreciated by those who are subject to the receipt of impressions by influx. Those who write from such impressions know that anything like mental labor, like an effort to direct or control the sentiment being expressed, is fatal to these impressions; and just so far as they do influence or control the writing by their own mental efforts, will they mar the beauty, if not impair the truthfulness of what they write. This I have found to be true from my own experience. My experience for the last year has uniformly taught me that the utmost passiveness is essential to me if I would write successfully upon any spiritual subject. Let me become anxious or curious even to know to what conclusions I shall be likely to arrive, and I may as well lay down my pen and burn up my paper. No matter how clearly my subject may stand out before my mind, if I

attempt to consider any more of it than is passing under the point of my pen at the time, thought ceases to flow, and confusion takes the place of order.

The reason for this must be perfectly obvious. When I attempt to arrange thoughts by mental labor, I at once call my intellectual faculties into exercise, and by such exercise I give my exterior selfhood dominion over my interior, so that spiritual truths can not flow into my inmost by influx; and as my exterior or intellectual faculties can not appreciate or make known to me spiritual truths in their inmost significance, I have by such intellectual effort excluded the only means by which those interior truths could flow into my inmost.

As man can appreciate spiritual truths only in his inmost, and as those truths can only be presented or communicated to the mind by influx or intuition, and as influx can only take place, or the voice of intuition can only be heard when the intellectual and other faculties of the mind are in a state of passiveness, it follows as a matter of course, that seasons of quiet and tranquil communion with our inmost souls, calling into exercise our inmost loves, delights and aspirations, will be favorable to intuitional development, and consequently will favor the reception of spiritual truths by influx.

It was this kind of exercise in which Christ engaged frequently. The forty days and nights in the wilderness previous to the commencement of public teachings, were spent in these interior exercises. He was led to that quiet and retired spot, far away from the sin and bustle of the world, by the influence of spirits who were engaged in preparing him for his mission. His exercises there were in the highest degree intuitional; spiritual truths poured into his mind by divine influx; and thus the inmost was strengthened and developed, and obtained entire ascendancy over the exterior selfhood, so that when he again came before the world, he was superior to all its influences, its trials and temptations. The exterior was in a state of subjectivity to the interior, and thus, to use his own language, he was "sanctified and sent into the world."

As soon as this period of interior communion in the wilderness terminated, he came before the world, and for the first time mani-

fested the powers peculiar to interior development. He early surprised Nathaniel, by calling him by name the first time he spake with him, and telling him he saw him while he was under the fig-tree before Philip called him; and it was in pursuance of this principle that he enjoined upon his followers, that when they prayed or communed with God, they should enter into their closets and shut the door, and thus in secret give expression to their inmost desires and aspirations; and it was in pursuance of the same principle that he frequently retired from the multitude into the mountains and deserts, and spent whole nights in seasons of private communion.

By these exercises his inmost was constantly developing and gaining strength; and in consequence of this development, he possessed and exercised the extraordinary powers he manifested. He drew his wisdom and power from the fountain head, and drew it as fast as by his interior expansion he became receptive of it. This he understood and recognized. When inquired of by his disciples how this power was to be obtained, his reply was "by prayer," interior communion "and fasting," true external abstemiousness, which tended to weaken or reduce the exterior selfhood, and thus enable the interior to obtain dominion. When inquired of how this power was to be exercised, his answer was, by faith, and his declaration was that those who pursued the same course with him, might obtain and exercise the same wisdom and power; that he had nothing but what he received, and that they could have the same by putting themselves in a state of interior receptivity.

Man in his inmost, being like God, being superior to reason, as in his *intellectual* faculties he is superior to sensation, must understand that if he would derive light and knowledge from the Spirit-world respecting the mode of existence and action of Spirits there, he must derive that light and knowledge in his inmost; and as that inmost can only be enlightened and expanded by *influx* or intuition, it must depend upon himself whether he gets light from the Spirit-world or not. Unless he is willing to pursue such an exercise as will tend to unfold his inmost, and make it receptive of truths by *influx*, he can have no truths by *influx*, and consequently can get no real light or knowledge from the

celestial spheres. Unless he will retire within himself, and hold candid, secret communion with his inmost soul, although she has a voice to speak intuitively to him, she can not make that voice heard, and the skeptical and caviling must go darkling in his inmost, until he will be honest enough with himself to consent to become instructed in spiritual truths in the only way in which he can be instructed—by the voice of intuition or the impressions of divine influx.

Man, in his exterior or intellectual selfhood, can become prepared for being instructed in his interior or inmost selfhood; that is, he can attend to such exterior or intellectual evidences of the existence, presence and power of Spirits, as are addressed to his animal and intellectual perceptions; and the first form of spiritual manifestation are, and necessarily must be, addressed to his exterior or intellectual perceptions. But he must not expect that such exterior forms of manifestations can reveal to him interior truths, or that of themselves they will tend even to develop his inmost or intuitional being. These exterior forms can not reach his interior being; they can only play that part of John Baptist by preparing the way and making the path straight, by which his inmost can be reached by divine influx.

These exterior forms of manifestation never have and never can reveal an interior or spiritual truth. They can exteriorly or intellectually satisfy the mind of the existence of interior or celestial truths, but they can not reveal those truths in their inmost signification. Therefore all effort to ascertain the true state or condition of the celestial world through the agency of rapping sounds, pantomimic representations, or written communications, will be unable to accomplish that object; because all these modes of communication must necessarily be addressed to the senses or intellectual faculties, which can not communicate with the inmost or celestial soul.

But we are not thence to infer that these modes of communication are useless; on the contrary, they are indispensable, and have a most important mission to perform in preparing the intellectual selfhood to make way for the influx of these celestial truths into the celestial selfhood of man. As before observed, there can be no influx of spiritual truths into the inmost, until it

is sufficiently expanded to become receptive of them, and intuition can not speak so as to make its resident truths heard and felt, until the exterior is brought into a state of relative passiveness; and these exterior manifestations are necessary to call the exterior or intellectual selfhood off from other and antagonistic pursuits, and turn it in the direction of these celestial truths.

When these exterior manifestations have done that—when they have perfected an intellectual conviction of the existence of these celestial truths—they have done all they can do for the individual. What remains to be done is for the exterior animal, and intellectual selfhood to come into a passive or quiescent state in respect to the interior or celestial selfhood, and thus give an opportunity for the voice of intuition to be heard, and for divine truth to flow into and expand the inmost soul. Then, and not till then, will man begin to understand and appreciate some of these interior or celestial truths.

These things being understood, it will be perceived that one mind can not be spiritually enlightened for another. Every man must be interiorly enlightened for himself, and it must depend upon himself whether he is thus interiorly enlightened. If he will not so examine these subjects as to become intellectually convinced of the existence of these spiritual truths, he will not be disposed to commune with himself respecting these truths; he will not bring his exterior selfhood into a passive or quiescent state, that he may converse with his inmost or celestial soul, and consequently he will not hear its inarticulate voice upon this subject, and will have little or no divine influx, because interiorly he is not in a receptive condition.

Although one man like Jesus or Swedenborg may become interiorly enlightened, and may have the highest conceptions of interior or celestial truths, yet he can only teach those truths to the exterior or intellectual man, which can not appreciate them in their interior or celestial signification, and which can not convey those truths to the interior. When I listen to the teachings of Jesus or Swedenborg as they fall from their lips or appear upon paper, I listen only in my exterior selfhood, and can perceive only such truths as fall within the scope of my intellectuality. Those which go beyond that, and are addressed to my

inmost, I can not perceive. Hence the remark of Jesus respecting those who listened to his discourses, "Hearing they hear not, and seeing, they do not understand."

I can only perceive the truthfulness of the celestial teachings of Christ or Swedenborg, or any other inspired teacher; so far as in my inmost I am in a condition to be receptive of those teachings by influx. If it were possible in the nature of language and truth, that one man could be so inspired as to perfectly conceive and comprehend all celestial truths, and pen them down, so that in their external expression they could be read, it would be no revelation to those who were not interiorly developed to the sphere of those truths.

The only use in presenting interior or celestial truths to the senses or intellectual faculties of man, is to induce him to retire within himself, and consult and commune with his inmost, in order that he may be instructed by divine influx, or by innate or resident truths within. This exterior instruction is designed to bring the exterior into a state of harmonious passiveness and quiescence. If it succeeds in doing this, it will be useful; if not, it will be of no avail.

Hence it must be apparent to all that our knowledge of celestial truths must depend upon ourselves. If we would be instructed in the realities of the Spirit-world, we must become our own mediums; we must so exercise ourselves as to develop our inmosts and make them receptive of these spiritual truths. We must so subdue and harmonize our exterior selfhood with our inmost or celestial selfhood, as to bring it into a state of spiritual subjectivity to our inmost. To do this we must habitually reverence truth or justice and virtue. It must become our meat and our drink to be constantly desiring and seeking after the highest good and destiny of our fellow-beings. We must constantly try to add something to the well-being and happiness of those about us; we must try to fulfill some want, relieve some pain, add some new comfort and consolation to the afflicted and distressed. We must try to become a sort of spiritual sun, from which a celestial light and genial heat will emanate, to enlighten and make glad the hearts of all about us.

Exercises of this kind will proceed from the inmost soul, and will develop and expand it, will give it strength and vigor; and it will begin to make its intuitional voice heard, and the current of divine influx will be felt in the soul, revealing to it those high and celestial truths which the eye hath not seen, the ear hath not heard, nor hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive.

Let us then understand the object of these present exterior manifestations. They are not to reveal to us interior or celestial truths. They can not do it, because celestial truths can not be communicated in such a way. Celestial truths can only be *felt* and *known* in the inmost soul of man; and to be *felt* and *known* therein, they must be *resident* there, or they must flow in by divine influx.

If God himself were to appear, and give an articulate voice to the thunder, to speak celestial truths to the world, or were he to make the lightning his pen, and write those truths in characters of fire upon the arch of the heavens, so that all could read, man could not understand the revelation any further than his inmost soul could *feel* and *know* within itself those truths.

Such an exhibition of power and intelligence in the external manifestation of speaking thunder and recording lightning, might silence the caviling skeptic, and humble the proud and aspiring intellect of him who refused to know any other than an intellectual and *rationl* God, and thus might prepare the man to turn his attention within, and converse with the god within his own breast, where he would begin to hear the echo of the voice of the true God without, and resident truth would begin to manifest itself, the interior would begin to expand with conscious life, and celestial truth would flow in, and thus the true revelation would be made.

Those who are looking for higher instruction through mediums exterior to themselves, who are expecting to see the heavens opened, and celestial truths revealed to them as physical and scientific truths are revealed, without interiorly preparing themselves for those truths, must be prepared to be disappointed. The vain, proud and selfish worldling, intent after the treasures

of earth, may hear the voice, may see the external form of truth, but he will be of those who hearing, hear not, and seeing, do not understand.

The intellectual giant may strut through the earth and conquer all exterior, philosophical or scientific truths, yet in his inmost he will be darker than Egyptian night. When he approaches the borders of the celestial spheres, he will find that his scientific knowledge will become *opaque* in the presence of celestial light.

He who expects spiritual or celestial light must enter within his own soul and set his house in order. He must honestly, earnestly and calmly commune with his inmost soul, and aid it in bringing his exterior nature into a state of harmonious subjectivity to his inmost loves and delights; or as expressed by Christ, "If any man love me and keep my commandments, my Father will love him, and we will come and make our abode with him."

PROPOSITIONS.

PERFECT wisdom and power, impelled by perfect love, would not beget any plan of government which would involve any more suffering than was necessary and useful for the highest good and destiny of the subjects thereof.

Hence any suffering for sin, not necessarily attendant upon its antagonism, or continued after it could by no possibility work for the good of the sufferer, would impeach the wisdom and goodness of the Divine Being.

Hence to limit the period in which an immortal being could repent and make restitution, would involve the consequences of eternal suffering in a being without the possibility of any good resulting from it.

MAN never intended God any injury, and never did him any, and consequently he can have no remorse in that respect.

LIFE OF CHRIST.

IN introducing the history of the life and teachings of Jesus Christ, it is proper to speak first of those circumstances which surrounded him, and the influence of which he was compelled to contend with, as well as the character and opinions of his historians upon whom we are obliged mainly to rely for all the especial information we have respecting him. All these things must be taken into consideration before we can come to anything like a truthful estimate of his real character and teachings. To understand truly the meaning of much of the sayings of Christ, we must be able to place ourselves in his situation, so far as external circumstances were concerned—look upon the character and opinions of those whom he was addressing, and ascertain what were the errors in their minds which he was endeavoring to correct.

The Jewish nation, of which he was a member, were firmly established in the opinion that they, as a nation, had been, from very ancient times, an object of the especial favor and regard of the Divine Being. They were well satisfied that God had, in an especial manner, revealed himself to their nation, and made known to them what was pleasing to himself, as well as what was displeasing; and that he had, through them, determined to establish on earth a temporal government which should become universal and perpetual.

They firmly believed that divinely inspired prophets of their nation had foreseen the future greatness and glory of their expected government, and that God, through them, had declared that all these things should come to pass. In view of this expected government, their prophets had foretold that in the fullness of time, a Messiah, a Prince and Savior, should be born, who should redeem them from the hands of their enemies, and should

establish himself forever upon the throne of David. This expected Prince and Messiah was to the Jewish nation the highest ideal of a temporal king. They were accustomed to speak of him as their Lord, their Redeemer, etc., in reference to the high mission he was to accomplish for them.

But it must be remembered that prophet, priest and people understood all these things as referring to a temporal prince and a temporal kingdom. It is a feature of the Jewish theology, that all of God's threatenings and promises had strict reference to this life; and in estimating the Jewish ideal of religion, we must not forget this important feature. Their religion did not teach the doctrines of the immortality of the soul, and a future existence of rewards and punishments. It was not an essential qualification of a Jewish high priest that he should believe in a future state of existence. The doctrine of a future life, connected with the resurrection of the physical body, belonged to a sect in philosophy, but not in religion.

The Jewish nation had a ceremonial religion which they believed was given to their fathers by God himself; that he had superintended in an especial manner the establishment of their ritual; and they believed that any departure from that ritual was a violation of the expressed commands of Jehovah, and would provoke the anger and vengeance of God. To them religion was a means of propitiating the favor of God; and they kept the ordinances thereof with an eye single to such propitiation.

Their religion, with them, was as animal and selfish as any other interest which engaged their attention. Their ideal of God was very far from the truth. They did not suppose that war, or slavery, or lust, was incompatible with that character or condition of mind which entitled a man to the especial favor of God. Their saints were not remarkable for their meekness, gentleness, purity and love; on the other hand, they were rather remarkable for possessing quite the opposite character.

To constitute a Jewish saint, it was necessary that he should keep with the most scrupulous exactness, all the commands and ordinances of the law as detailed in their religious ritual. He must attend to the requirements and duties of their feast days and fast days, their new moons and Sabbaths. But if he was careful to

do these things, he might enslave as many of the heathen as he had power; he might have as many wives, and keep as many concubines, as he had the means to support. He might carry on as many wars and take as many captives—fill himself with the spoils of victory, provided he would share his plunder with the Lord—as he pleased. With such ideas of the character and requirements of God, and of the qualification of saintship, we can understand somewhat the character of the people among whom Christ first attempted to introduce his religion, and the obstacles with which he had to contend.

And it must not be forgotten that the historians of Christ belonged to the Jewish nation, and partook of their general views. Their ideal of God, of religion, and of religious worship, was of this Jewish stamp. The disciples of Christ never changed their religious opinions during the time Christ remained with them, nor did they understand that he desired them to change their opinions.

They were aware that Christ entertained no very profound respect for the Jewish saints in the persons of the Scribes and Pharisees; that he required a higher standard of moral character than they maintained, but they did not understand that he taught any change in their religious observances or ordinances. They understood him to claim to be the temporal Prince and Messiah so long expected by their nation, and that the kingdom of heaven he came to establish was the temporal kingdom to be established among the Jews.

And they continued in this opinion during all the time Christ remained with them, and they interpreted all his sayings in the light of this false ideal. At the time of Christ's crucifixion, they probably had not one truthful idea respecting his character and mission. They had not truly apprehended one word which Christ had uttered respecting himself, or the kingdom he came to establish.

The apostles thus entirely misapprehending the character and teachings of Christ, and continuing in the Jewish faith until from time to time they were corrected by the Spirit of truth which illuminated their minds as fast as by development they were receptive of such illuminations, were not the most infallible

expounders of the doctrines of Christ. Their first ideals of him and his doctrines were entirely false, and consequently there were many things connected with his teachings which were unnoticed by them, or after considerable lapse of time were forgotten. That they were subject to the influx of the Spirit at times can not be doubted; and that we are indebted to that influx for the mention of many things which the Spirit brought to their remembrance, I can not for a moment doubt. In fact, the internal evidences of that fact are to my mind too clear to be doubted.

We must not overlook the object for which those histories were written. It can not be denied that those who wrote those histories did so to perpetuate and publish to the world their view of the evidence which the life and teachings of Christ furnished, of his being the long expected Messiah of the Jewish nation; and they considered the wonderful works wrought by him, as furnishing the most important item of that evidence. At the times when the various books of the New Testament were written, the apostles and general believers in Christ were expecting his speedy return to this world to establish a temporal kingdom. They supposed that event was only delayed to give them an opportunity to fulfill the final commission he gave to them, to go into all the world and proclaim the glad tidings to all people or nations. Paul supposed the return of Christ would take place during the generation in which he lived. He said distinctly that all they to whom he was writing, would not sleep, that is, die before the second coming of Christ, but that all would be changed. The mortal would put on immortality, and death and the grave would be robbed of their power.

Their views of Christ after his disappearance from among them, were changed more in form than in spirit. Their views of his temporal Messiahship were not essentially changed. They embraced more of the spiritual than before, but they could not separate the spiritual from the temporal. They could not conceive of spiritual life and consciousness as appertaining to man, divested of his physical body. The dead to them slept in a state of unconsciousness, and would continue thus to rest from their labors until the general resurrection. Paul thought and argued that the immor-

tality of the soul depended upon the literal resurrection of the physical body.

The principle difference between their views, before and after the disappearance of Christ from among them, respecting the Messiahship of Christ, was this: Before his arrest, condemnation and death, they supposed his mission as the Messiah was to the Jewish nation alone, and to those only who were living upon the earth. They had no idea that his administration was to affect at all those who were in their graves, any more than the administration of David or Solomon did. And furthermore, they did not expect that his enemies were to be utterly annihilated or driven from the world, but that they would be overcome and kept in subjection to his government; and they expected that Christ would take the first favorable opportunity to establish himself upon the Jewish throne.

But after the crucifixion and reappearance of Christ, their views from time to time were somewhat modified. The first modification of any considerable amount, had respect to the immortality of constitution which Christ attained by passing through the grave. They had not previously thought of that. So far were they from supposing anything of that kind necessary, that when they saw him taken and slain, they gave up all as lost. Their hopes were entombed with his body, and the women had prepared their ointments and spices for embalming his body, and were on that errand when they heard that he was risen from the dead, and even his chosen eleven did not believe the story, when Mary and the other women told what they had seen and heard. But when they became satisfied that he was yet alive—when their own eyes had seen and their own ears had heard his voice—then their old idea of Messiahship revived, with the additional thought that he had become immortal, and was prepared literally to establish an everlasting kingdom, and to become their everlasting king; and they were now looking daily for the establishment of that kingdom.

The next change or modification of their opinions respecting him, took place at the time of his ascension, which to them was as unexpected as was his death and resurrection. They had just

inquired of him if he would not then restore the kingdom to Israel, when this separation took place; and they would have been utterly confounded had not the two men in shining apparel have told them that in due time he would return again. After recovering a little from their astonishment, they then began to understand the reason why Christ had sent them out into all nations after they had supposed their labors were ended. It then occurred to their minds that the Jews were not ready to receive Christ as their prince and deliverer, and that they were to go forth into all the world to make them ready by demonstrating to them from their Scriptures, and proving to them by their own testimony, that Jesus of Nazareth was in truth the promised Prince and Messiah, and that Jesus had gone into heaven, there to remain until, through their labor, the Jews were prepared to receive Him, and that then he would return and establish the kingdom of the Jews; and Peter commenced his preaching at Jerusalem by presenting this view of the subject, and he became very bold, as he always was, when he felt quite certain he was right. But this change or modification of opinion did not extend to a change of view as to what was to constitute the kingdom of heaven or the Messiahship of Christ.

The next important change of opinion, or rather addition to their opinions, occurred some years afterward, at or near the time of Peter's vision which called him to the house of Cornelius, a Gentile. Up to this time they had supposed their labors were to be confined to the Jews, as, in their estimation, they were to be the only subjects of that kingdom which Christ came to establish. The spirit of truth had not succeeded in so far enlightening them as to lead them to suppose that the Gentiles were to become objects of divine favor. Now by degrees they began to believe that the Gentiles could become true subjects of Christ's kingdom by being grafted on the old Jewish stock. Still they deemed it important that they should become Jews before they could be recognized as Christians, and their views of the temporal Messiahship of Christ, and the temporality of the kingdom of heaven, remained unchanged.

During this period, a new idea was also making progress in their minds, respecting the extension of this kingdom over those

who had fallen asleep in the true faith. According to their previous ideas, the blessings of that government could only extend to those who were living upon the earth, and while they lived upon it. The dead knew nothing and could enjoy nothing. There was no knowledge, device or wisdom in the grave. Under these circumstances, what benefit had those to expect who should die before Christ's government should be established? Cruel and bloody persecutions had broken out against the faithful witnesses of Christ's Messiahship, and many of them were being put to death. Now, according to their former views, all such would be without reward. The investigations growing out of this subject finally led them to the conclusion that those who died in the true faith were only resting from their labors, and that when Christ came they would be raised from the dead and would thus become immortal, and would live and reign with him forever. It was out of this question that the doctrines of a future life finally became a part of their teachings, and the resurrection of Christ's body from the tomb was the evidence they relied upon to prove such an event possible in respect to themselves. Difficulties were suggested among themselves, to answer which Paul's argument on the subject of the resurrection, addressed to the Corinthians, was written. Said Paul in that argument, "Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead? But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen; then is our preaching false, and your faith is also false; yea, and we are found false witnesses of God, because we have testified of God that he raised up Christ, whom he raised not up, if so be that the dead rise not. For if the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised; and if Christ be not raised, then is your faith false; ye are yet in your sins; then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished. If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable."

It was in this manner that the first teachers of Christianity progressed in their views respecting the character of Christ and the nature of the kingdom he came to establish. They continued from time to time to obtain new ideas respecting it; but they never advanced far enough to lose sight of a temporal Messiah-

ship and a temporal kingdom. They never understood the declaration of Christ when he said, "My kingdom is not of this world"—"the kingdom of heaven is within thee. Hence much of their teachings were designed to convey to the mind an ideal which in itself was false; and they did convey that false ideal, and it has been continued in the Church down to the present day. Among these false ideals are the doctrines of the literal resurrection of the body, a general judgment, the second death, a literal and personal reign of Christ upon the earth, out of which has arisen the doctrines of the Second Adventists.

These early teachers of Christianity being Jews by birth and education, still continued in all the essentials of their Jewish faith. They engrafted the Christian system upon the doctrines of the Jews, and considered their Christian doctrines as spiritualized Judaism. In this they differed in their views from the teachings of Christ. He never intended to have his system in any manner connected with the Jewish. Said he upon that subject, "No man putteth a piece of new cloth unto an old garment," "neither do they put new wine into old bottles," but "new wine must be put into new bottles." But the apostles attempted to put the new wine into the old Jewish bottles, and, as Christ said, the bottles have burst, and the wine has been spilled. And the system of Christianity which has been handed down in the teachings of the Church, is little else than the fragments of the old bottle.

Therefore in presenting the system of truths taught and practiced by Christ, it is very important that we understand the views of those who became his historians, that we may distinguish between their facts and opinions, between their ideals and the ideal of Christ. If by any means we can aim at the fundamental principles of Christ's system, knowing the fundamentals of that in which the apostles believed, we can very accurately determine how much of what they recorded was reality, and how much was merely ideal.

The first thing to be noticed in examining the several histories of Christ which have come down to us as true and genuine, is the character of the historians, and the means they severally had of knowing the truth of what they stated. Those who were con-

stantly with Christ during the three years of his ministry, had the best opportunity of knowing the facts which transpired in connection with his public teachings, and if honest in their statements, would be the most reliable authority. Of the Gospel writers, but two of them were the immediate disciples of Christ, namely, Matthew and John, neither of whom were with him until some months after his public ministry commenced, and knew little or nothing of him. Mark was a nephew and disciple of Peter, and probably wrote his account as he received it from him. Luke was the most learned and systematic writer, although he had little personal means of knowing the truth of his statements. He wrote mostly from common report, such things as were generally believed among the disciples at the time he wrote; and he states in the introduction to his history, that his object in writing was to set forth in order those things which were believed among the disciples, because many others had previously attempted it, and there seemed to be some discrepancy occasioning doubt and uncertainty in respect to those things. Luke wrote to his friend to correct these doubts, and to enable him to know the certainty of those things worthy of credit connected with the life and teachings of Christ.

It is further important to notice that all the historians, with the exception of John, make no mention of the doctrines taught by Christ, or of the events which transpired after the commencement of his public ministry, until some six or eight months of his ministry had expired. Luke mentions an event which happened a week or so previous to the call of Peter, Andrew, James, and John, to become the disciples of Christ, while Matthew and Mark omit everything from Christ's return from the wilderness up to the time of his going to Capernaum and calling the above mentioned to be his disciples.

The omission is natural enough, because they had no personal knowledge of what took place during that period of time; and as nothing of greater importance transpired before the call of Peter and the others, than was constantly being repeated afterward, they did not deem it important to notice those earlier transactions. John, however, although not an eye-witness of those things, thought proper to connect the transactions of that eight months

with the other portions of his public ministry. In fact, it is generally believed that John wrote his history more as a supplement to the others than to give a full account of the ministry of Christ, because he notices those things mainly which the others omit to mention.

To my mind, John would have been by far the best historian who could have written upon the general subject of Christ's ministry. He was most in the confidence of Christ. He was, in fact, the beloved disciple, and was better qualified to understand him than any of the others. I can not doubt that John obtained the facts which transpired previous to the commencement of his discipleship, from Christ's own lips, and there is in John's history a deep spiritual significance which is not to be found in the writings of the other historians. Had John given us a full history, it would have been very valuable indeed.

Matthew was not a good historian. He was careless and disorderly in his facts. In his history nothing like order is observed. He has strangely mixed up the facts, and the utmost confusion seemed to prevail in his mind. He was not careful in his quotations. In quoting the fulfillment of prophecies, he quotes at random. He belonged to that class of mind which is quick enough to observe a fact, but very slow to discover the principle. He was rapid enough to acquire knowledge, but very slow in converting that knowledge into wisdom. He would do very well for a tax-gatherer. He would be able to detect the genuineness and value of the coin, but I doubt if he could have kept his accounts in an orderly manner.

The first thing to which our attention is called in looking into the history of Christ, is that of his parentage. This, in itself, is not important at all, for a man is valuable or not for what he is, and not for what his parents were. His doctrines are valuable or not in themselves for what they are, and not from the character of him who promulgates them. Truth is truth, and falsehood is falsehood, come from what source they may. But the parentage of Christ is made a matter of much importance by the importance which the world have been taught to attach to it; and the singular deductions which are made to follow upon that

point are made to turn the question whether he was man or God, and much of his teachings are construed in reference to that fact. In truth, his whole character, and office and mission are made to turn upon that question. It therefore becomes a matter of importance to settle his parentage.

Matthew and Luke claim for him the literal parentage of God or the Holy Spirit, and they were undoubtedly strengthened in that opinion by declarations which Christ made respecting himself, and which, according to their condition of mental development, they could not otherwise understand. They knew no other way of interpreting the expressions, "I am the Son of God," "I came down from heaven," "I and my Father are one," and others of a similar character. Their ideas of God and of man's relations to him, were such that they could give no especial significance to such expression without interpreting them to mean that Christ was literally the son of God, and it is very probable that the account of Christ's parentage and birth originated in this way. It at first was merely conjectural; it finally grew into report, and was believed by many. Everything almost favors this idea. Their histories were not written until probably all certain means of information on that point had passed away. They were not written, according to the very best of information, until Zacharias and Elizabeth, and Joseph and Mary were, in their graves. Such a report was not current in the neighborhood of Nazareth during the life-time of Jesus, for he was the reputed son of Joseph and Mary. His own brothers and sisters had heard nothing of the kind, and did not believe on him up to very near the time of his crucifixion. These things favor the idea that this report did not get into circulation until sometime after his death.

There are many incidents mentioned in these histories which go far to demonstrate that the accounts of this matter in Matthew and Luke are not correct—that they took them from mere rumor, and believed them to be true for reasons before alluded to. That Matthew should get duped in this way is not at all surprising, for the character of his mind was such that he would be an easy subject. Luke was a more learned man, and naturally

had a clearer and more methodical mind, and would have been more likely to have looked more carefully into the subject. But still he was very liable to be misled for reasons before stated.

It is safe to state that if the accounts of Matthew and Luke upon this point are true, Zacharias and Elizabeth, and Joseph and Mary would have been likely to know it, and it is natural to infer that they would have indicated that knowledge in their conduct. Yet such does not appear to be the fact, and even those historians who give credit to the miraculous conception of Jesus, do not in their histories give any incidents connected with the conduct of these individuals in their after lives which would indicate any such knowledge or belief; but on the contrary, there are incidents mentioned quite irreconcilable with such supposed knowledge.

By reading the first chapter of Luke's history, it will be perceived that according to that account it was well known to Mary and Elizabeth that Elizabeth was to be the mother of John Baptist, who was to come in the spirit and power of Elias to prepare the way for the coming of the promised Messiah, and that Mary was to be the mother of that Messiah who was the begotten of the Spirit of God; and by reading the account of Matthew it also appears that Joseph became a party to a portion of that knowledge so far as the parentage of Jesus was concerned, and it can not very naturally be supposed that he was not made acquainted with the whole transaction from the lips of Mary herself; nor can it be supposed that Elizabeth kept Zacharias uninformed as to what took place during the time of Mary's visit, when she was filled with the Holy Ghost, and had the spirit of prophecy upon her; nor would it be straining credulity very far to believe that if, according to those accounts, these facts had become thus known to these persons, and were so firmly believed as to satisfy Joseph in respect to the character of his wife, they would also have been hinted at among some of their near friends and relations, who were looking for the redemption of Israel; and especially would it seem to have been necessary that some explanation should be given to the parents and immediate acquaintances of Mary, to vindicate her conduct and character, under the circumstances. For according to the ac-

counts, she was exposed to the vilest slander, and so exposed that there could have been no possible concealment. It must have become notorious in her immediate circle of friends, that she had conceived out of the bonds of wedlock, and some explanation was imperatively demanded. And these accounts of the cause of her situation being true, she could have had no motive in withholding that explanation from her near friends, by means of which she not only would have vindicated her character, but would have elevated it above its former standing; and according to Luke she could have fortified her word through the testimony of Zacharias, Elizabeth, Anna and good old Simeon, as well as by the word of Joseph himself, according to Matthew.

The public manner in which Anna and Simeon spoke of him in the temple, and their convictions respecting him according to Luke, must have excited considerable influence over the minds of those who were present, and especially upon the minds of Joseph and Mary, connected as it was with what had previously transpired, and corroborative as it was of it.

And, again, according to Matthew, the attention of the Eastern Magi was called to this subject, and they came probably into Jerusalem, and inquired after the infant Christ whom they had learned was already born, and they so published the matter, in such earnestness that Herod was troubled and all Jerusalem with him, and so strong were Herod's convictions that he sent to Bethlehem and had all the infants of two years old and under, slain. These things must have created a great deal of excitement and talk, and the conviction must have been pretty deeply settled upon the minds of the family, and upon the minds of the Magi and the Judean shepherds, that the Messiah was really born, and that conviction thus settled would have been likely to manifest itself on subsequent occasions.

Matthew says that Joseph became satisfied of the innocence of Mary through a vision in his sleep, and also in the same way he was admonished to take his wife and her son and flee into Egypt, and remain there until the angel should bring him word, for Herod would certainly seek the young child's life; and that Joseph did accordingly, and remained there until after the death of Herod, when he was again admonished to return, for they were

dead who sought to kill the child—that Joseph obeyed the admonition, and instead of returning to Bethlehem where, from Matthew's account, we should infer he belonged, he turned aside and came into Galilee, and dwelt in Nazareth, because he feared Archelaus who was then ruling in Judea in the place of his father Herod.

Now this account of Matthew is not sustained by any other historian, sacred or profane; and from the character of Matthew as a historian, it is hardly entitled to credit upon his word. We do not by this question his honesty, but his capacity to judge of the truth of such matters. We have already had occasion to remark of him, that he was a very careless writer, good enough to observe a fact falling under his own observation, but good for nothing to declare principles. He was a better tax-gatherer than historian. He was not careful enough to understand the subject about which he wrote, and was very liable to hazard opinions without proper investigation.

Of all the disciples there were none of them so perfectly Jewish, in body and soul, as Matthew. Like Paul, he was a Hebrew of the Hebrews, although not like Paul an educated one. Matthew could see nothing in Jesus except through Hebrew eyes. His characteristic carelessness is seen in his quotations of prophecies as referring to Jesus. The very first one he quoted had no more reference to Christ than it had to himself. The prophecy of Isaiah, that a "virgin should conceive," etc., was given as a sign to Ahaz seven hundred and fifty years before the birth of Jesus, which was to take place during the lifetime of Ahaz, else it could have been no sign to him, and the fulfillment is recorded to have taken place agreeably to the prediction, all of which will be seen by reading carefully the seventh and eighth chapters of Isaiah. His next quotation is equally inapplicable. He says that Joseph was sent into and remained in Egypt until the death of Herod, "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Out of Egypt have I called my son." The matter referred to by Matthew is not a prophecy at all. Hosea is representing the Lord as complaining of the ingratitude of Israel. He had been calling Israel an empty vine, bringing forth fruit unto himself—with the increase of his fruits

incensing his altars, and multiplying graven images, that is, running into idolatry; and, among other things, he makes the Lord say, in speaking of what he had done for Israel, "When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and I called my son out of Egypt! As they called them, so they went; they sacrificed unto Balaam; they burned incense to graven images," etc. Now, would Matthew and his expounders have us believe that this language prophetically referred to Christ? Would they have us understand that God said of Christ, "He is an empty vine," "his heart is divided, and shall be found faulty;" that he "had sacrificed to Balaam, and had burned incense to graven images?" They must have us so understand, if they give credit to the appropriateness of Matthew's quotation; and thus it is with all the rest of his proof texts. This of itself indicates the carelessness of the man—demonstrates that in such things he is not entirely reliable.

Such being the evident character of Matthew, I am justified in saying that his authority alone is not sufficient to entitle his statements to credit, especially in respect to those things of which he had no personal knowledge. A very slight rumor would be sufficient to cause him to set down fiction for fact. There are many other incidents mentioned in his history to which I might refer, illustrative of this same trait in his character. I doubt not that during the period of more than sixty years, which had elapsed after the time these events were said to have taken place, and before Matthew wrote his history, many curious and false reports had been put in circulation respecting the parentage of Jesus; and Matthew, as a Hebrew, took the one which came the nearest to his idea of the truth.

The rest of the historians say nothing about Jesus going into Egypt with Joseph and his mother, nor do they maintain any of the incidents inducing or attending that journey; but on the contrary, Luke would lead us to suppose that it was not so; for after Jesus was taken to the temple to be circumcised, and after the days of purification were past, and all that the law required had been performed, Luke says that they returned to Nazareth, and that his parents went up to Jerusalem every year to attend the feast of the passover. Now, if it had been a well-

established fact that Joseph and Mary had been obliged to take refuge in Egypt to avoid the murderous suspicions of Herod, Luke would have been very likely to have known and noticed it. But such does not appear to be the case. That was not one of the facts which was generally believed among Luke's acquaintance.

Again: Had it been true that Herod and all Jerusalem were troubled about the supernatural appearance of the star in the East, as an indication of the birth of the expected Messiah, and had his suspicions been so far confirmed in his mind as to cause him to search for and murder all the male children under two years old in Bethlehem, the fact would have been of importance enough to have found a place in all the Gospel histories, to say nothing of the other histories of the day. There would have been some pretty lasting monuments of such a conviction, attended with such an act, in the hearts and memories of the parents and friends, if not in the minds of the people at large. The utter silence, therefore, of all the other historians, both sacred and profane, as they are called, furnishes strong presumptive evidence that this part of Matthew's account is fabulous. Matthew must prove himself to be a very accurate historian in every other respect, if he would be believed under these circumstances in respect to these extraordinary facts.

But the account of the miraculous conception, as stated by Luke, lies under the same general impeachment. The inferences already alluded to in respect to the knowledge of Zacharias, Elizabeth, Joseph and Mary, and their immediate friends, is as applicable to Luke as to Matthew. If it be true that they were truly informed upon this subject, as Luke says they were, their subsequent conduct was and is utterly inexplicable. John Baptist could not have grown to be thirty years old, and have exhibited the signs of the Spirit, without being informed of the Messiahship of Christ. Mary knew the character and office of John; so did Elizabeth, so did Zachariah and Joseph; and they each knew the character and office of Jesus. They were kinsmen living in the same country, conversing together at their national feast days, and feeling the same common interest in the coming of the Messiah and the redemption of Israel; and furthermore, John knew and understood the nature of his office as the Elias, and he proclaimed himself to the world as the precursor of the

Christ. Can any one suppose that he could have remained ignorant of the character of Jesus during all this time, if Luke and Matthew's accounts of these transactions were correct? Can any one rationally suppose that the intimate friends and relations of these families could have been kept in ignorance? Yet John affirms his utter ignorance of the person of the Messiah. He said that he had been informed by the Spirit that the Messiah was then standing among the people, but he knew him not, and that he had come forth preaching and baptizing, that the real person might be made manifest; that the Spirit had signified to him that upon whom he should see the Spirit descending and remaining, the same would be the Messiah. This was the only means he had for determining who was the Christ.

Again: Had Jesus been begotten by the Holy Ghost, as Matthew and Luke affirm, and had Mary and Joseph had such evidence of the fact as these two historians affirm they had, it would be natural to suppose that they would have endeavored to make some provision for qualifying him for his mission, and not kept him at the carpenter's trade until he was thirty years of age. Knowing as they did that he was the incarnate Son of God, they conducted themselves very strangely. It would certainly have been reasonable to suppose that they could have taught their younger children to entertain more respect for him than to consider him as an impostor, and declare that he was insane or beside himself, and say they would bring him home by force; and certainly it would not have been expected that many would have joined and gone with them on such business. But so it was.

Jesus had occasion to complain of the want of respect manifested toward him from his own kinsfolk in Nazareth, after his mother and brethren had been after him, and it was this lack of respect which called forth the remark, "A prophet is not without honor save in his own country and among his own kinsfolk." And several months after this his own brethren came to him and challenged him to do the mighty works he pretended to do, openly before the world, and tauntingly said to him that "no man doeth anything in secret, and seeketh himself to be openly known. Therefore, said they, "If thou do these things, show thyself to the world." Can any one suppose that these children of Mary

would be allowed to treat their oldest brother in this manner, and that, too, in the presence of their mother, without rebuke, when she knew he was the Son of God, and the promised Messiah of the Jewish nation?

Furthermore, if Jesus was begotten in the manner set forth by Matthew and Luke, he was not a lineal descendant of David, and all the predictions respecting the Messiah failed to be realized in him. That he was the reputed Son of Joseph, both Matthew and Luke declare, and in tracing his lineage to David, they both trace him through his father Joseph. To obviate this difficulty, it has been said that the genealogy, although purporting to be that of Joseph, is in reality that of Mary. But this is merely a clerical quibble, and can not be sustained by any evidence in or out of the book.

There can be no reasonable doubt that Jesus was the legitimate son of Joseph and Mary; that he was universally recognized as such in the whole circle of his relatives and acquaintances; that no sentiment or opinion to the contrary ever prevailed until years after his death; that this opposite sentiment was created by those who long afterward entertained an idea that his power must emanate from a supernatural source; that he some way must have been a descendant of God, which grew into a rumor, and finally came to be recognized by some as veritable history. This idea may have been strengthened in them in view of certain declarations which Jesus made respecting his own character and mission, which in due time will be noticed.

BEHMEN'S IDEA OF GOD.—Jacob Behmen says: "When I consider what God is, then I say, he is the ONE. In reference to the creature he is as an eternal Nothing. He has neither foundation, beginning nor abode. He possesses nothing but only himself. He is the Will of the Abyss. He needs neither space nor place. He begets himself in himself, from eternity to eternity. He is neither like nor resembles anything, and has no peculiar place where he dwells. The eternal Wisdom or Understanding is his delight. He is the Will of the Wisdom; the Wisdom is his manifestation.

DESPOTISM OF HUMAN GOVERNMENTS.

THE relation which man sustains to the institutions of his own forming is a false one. The institutions of government are subordinate to man, and should be made to assume that position. They can never be made to perform their appropriate functions until the rights of the humblest being within their jurisdiction shall be held superior to the government. Said Christ, referring to the same principle, "The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath." So also is it in relation to governments; they are made for the use of man, not man for the use of governments. The error is, institutions have been upon or above men, whereas men should be above institutions. This doctrine was practically illustrated by our revolutionary fathers, when they declared their independence of Great Britain, and placed the natural rights of man above all institutions, declaring that governments were formed for the protection, not the destruction of rights.

All there is in human government is brute force. Their wisdom and virtue can not be relied upon. They are as liable to become the instruments of oppression in the hands of their administrators, as means of protection; and looking at them in the light of past history, and judging of them by their fruits, they are more liable to become oppressive than protective. All human governments hitherto existing, although differing in form and purporting to differ in principle, nevertheless have exhibited the same reckless disregard of the rights of man and of the sovereignty of the individual. Whatever may have been their theory, they have never failed to plant the iron heel of oppression upon the neck of the individual. There never was a human government which has not willfully and purposely crushed the individual; and in this respect they have been equally despotic.

In this respect the despotism of Russia, the monarchy of England, and the republicanism of the United States are alike in practice.

What in principle constitutes a despotism? It is where the will of an individual, or of individuals, is placed above the rights of man, and that will arms itself with power to crush the individual, and at pleasure does crush the individual; and it matters not in principle whether that will originate in a single individual, or in twenty or a million. The will and power to crush the individual constitutes the despotism. The disregard of the sovereignty of man and the inalienability of his natural rights is the crime of despotism. The difference between a despotism, a monarchy and a republic is only in the form and manner of doing the wrong, and the number concerned in willing it, not in the principle of the wrong itself. It is no less a crime for the people of a state or nation to place themselves above the rights of an individual, and despoil him of them, than it is for a single individual. If I am to be robbed of my rights, and be thrust into the mines of Siberia to wear out my existence, it matters not to me whether I am sent there by the edict of the Czar or by the enactments of a republic. I am none the less a victim of despotic power in the one case than in the other; and the power which crushed me is none the less despotic whether it be exercised by one or one million individuals.

The doctrine that we must obey unjust enactments; that we must submit to them while they stand upon the statute book, and do the wrong they command, is the doctrine of despotism. The doctrine that the king or ruling power can do no wrong, and therefore whatever he or it commands must be obeyed, is a blasphemous lie, neither true in theory nor practice. Truth is eternally true, and right is immutably right; and no being under any circumstances is at liberty to be false or unjust himself, or to constrain others to be so. If men can not associate together in society without robbing individuals of their sovereignty and of their natural and inalienable rights, then let them not associate. The rights of a single individual are of more worth than all societies or governments ever formed. But it is not true that men must be despoiled of any portion of their rights on coming into

society. That doctrine originated in the despotic principle that "might makes right," and in the despotic practice of placing the government above the individual, and making a distinction between the governors and the governed—in the practice of seating one portion of the people upon the necks of the other. If God, in creating man, and making his present and eternal well-being to consist in the free use of all the faculties with which he is endowed, and at the same time fixing upon him necessities which demanded that he should enter society and sacrifice the use of those faculties, has committed so gross a blunder, let us take the shortest course to demolish such a botched piece of mechanism, and let the Almighty try it over again, and see if he can not do better next time.

A government is a free or despotic one, according as it respects or despises the natural and inalienable rights of man. Whenever it evinces a design to crush a single individual—to disregard the rights of the humblest human being, it evinces a despotic will, and men are called upon to prepare for its overthrow. If its despotic conduct proceed from ignorance, that may mitigate its depravity, but will not excuse its continuance in power, unless it can be speedily enlightened.

That government can not properly be called a free government, where only those whose wills enter into its composition and action are perfectly protected. It is only entitled to the character of a free government, when it places the rights of every human being above all authority, and predicates all its legislation and action upon the inalienability of the natural rights of man as man—not as citizen or member of the government, but as a human being holding his rights under the sign manual of his Creator. To call that a free government which holds the natural rights of the humblest human being subordinate to its authority, is to make the most absolute despotism in principle as free as any other government. If that is to be called a free government which preserves and protects the rights of those who compose the government, whose wills enter into its enactments or edicts, then is the despotism of Russia in principle as free as the republic of the United States. Who can enjoy a larger liberty than the Czar of all the Russias? What sovereign Democrat in the

American Union can demand or ask for more perfect immunity in all his natural rights? The despotism of Russia protects itself in the most extended liberty. The Czar, and those who with him compose that government, have greater immunity than the American citizen possesses; but does it thence follow that the despotism is entitled to the character of a free government? I trow not.

Who can enjoy more perfect immunity than the Queen of England, or the lords spiritual, temporal, and the commons? Those who constitutionally compose the government of Great Britain are as sovereign and well protected in their natural rights as the boasted freemen of the United States. But does it thence follow that the monarchy of England is a free government? Are we thence to infer, because those who compose the government do not oppress themselves, that therefore their government is free? So also with the governments of the United States. What if protection and immunity are given to those who are the constituted sovereigns of the nation; is that any more, in principle or practice, than is done under the government of Russia or England, or any other monarchy or despotism in the world? It is not the character of governments of any form to deny to their administrators freedom and protection. But it is the character of all human governments, of whatever form, to debase and oppress those who are not recognized as a constituent portion of those governments.

The oppressions of despotic Russia are felt by those who have no voice or authority in the making and administering of the laws of that government. The poor serf and the humble subject, whose life and property are subject to the will and power of the government, are the ones who feel and can bear witness to the oppressive and despotic character of the government under which they live. That government is oppressive and despotic in its character, which will not protect man as man, or rather which will not respect the natural rights of man as inalienable. That government stamps itself as a despotism which treats any human being within its jurisdiction as out of the pale of its protection, and legislates irrespective of his rights. The despotic character of every government is seen in its oppression of those whose will

and power are not considered as a component part of the government.

The despotism of Russia consists in her disregard of the will and rights of those who are subject to her edicts. The oppressions of absolute monarchy, or of limited monarchy, are seen in the same thing, and the oppressions of republicanism are also to be seen in such practices. In our republic, and under our republican forms of government, the people are said to be sovereign; their will and power make and execute the laws. The people, or rather a certain class, sustain the same relation to our government in principle, that the Czar does to the government of Russia, or the Queen, lords and commons do to the government of England; and the same conduct which would make the Czar or despot, would make the government of England, in the person of the Queen and her ministers, the Lords and commons, and electors, despots, and would make the governing portion of the people of those States despots. Any power which sets itself above the rights of man, and willfully disregards those rights, is despotic, whether exercised by a single individual or by a million.

The despot does not oppress himself. The aristocratic government does not oppress the aristocratic class which constitutes the government; nor do the governing portion of the people of the United States oppress themselves, by denying to themselves the inalienable rights of man. But what is their conduct in respect to the millions of people who are not considered as constituting a portion of that government? Talk not of the despotism of Russia. Point not to the condition of the poor serf as an evidence of a despotic power not exercised in this country. The most abject of Russians have rights which, if secured to the American slave, would well nigh make him a free man. If the republicanism of America would respect the sanctity of the domestic circle, and protect the poor slave in the enjoyment of his domestic affections, and not permit the most tender and sacred ties that can bind the heart of one being to another, to be ruthlessly broken and crushed; if it would not permit the marital altar to be profaned, then might it claim in that respect to be no worse than the despotism of Russia. If the republicanism

of the United States would leave her serfs to grow up in ignorance or not as their own desires or circumstances might determine, and not fetter them down in ignorance by penal legislation, the American serf might rise to a level with the serf of Russia. But in these respects republican despotism crushes her abjects immeasurably below the abjects of absolute Russian despotism; and the will and power in the United States which does this, is none the less criminal or despotic than that which does it in Russia or Algiers. The principles of liberty are no more discarded, the rights of man are no more despised, and the demands of justice no more contemned, by Russian than by American despotism.

Then the character of a government does not depend upon the course it pursues toward those who administer in the several departments thereof, or toward those by whose will they administer; but it depends upon its conduct toward those who constitute no part of the government; who have no voice to make themselves heard in their legislative councils; who are stripped of all power, and lie weak and defenseless within its jurisdiction; who have no security for their rights but the image of the Almighty stamped upon their persons; in whose eye beams the light, and upon whose tongue throbs the accents of immortality. The course which a government pursues toward this class of persons determines its true character—determines whether it respects the rights of man as man, or whether it disregards those rights, and only respects his condition—determines whether the government is true or false, honest or corrupt, free or despotic.

Judged in this light, wherein can the government of the United States claim to possess a higher character than the most corrupt despotism on earth? Where is a government to be found which more willfully and wantonly trifles with the rights of man—not through ignorance of those rights, not even without acknowledging them as inalienable in man, but with a full knowledge of their sacredness, willfully, deliberately, and in contempt of justice, places the iron heel of despotism upon the necks of millions; and while standing upon her crushed victims, unfurls her banner in the sacred name of freedom, and shouts

liberty, and by so doing insults humanity and mocks the Almighty. What character can such a government claim at the tribunal of truth and justice? The despotism of Russia is free and spotless in its character, when compared with such a government. Before God and humanity she stands acquitted of the deep and damning guilt of these United States. The man that can call such a republicanism free, lies in his heart, and is adjudged false to freedom by every principle of truth, honesty and justice.

Never did a tyrant or despot on earth more deliberately or wantonly trample upon humanity or the rights of man, than have the professedly free governments of these United States; and if a willful or wanton disregard of right and justice can stamp a nation or an individual as corrupt and despotic, what plea can shield the governments of the United States from such a character?

It is no excuse that more are protected in the enjoyment of their natural rights under the American government, than under other forms of government. Those only are protected who have directly or indirectly a voice in the government; who can make their influence felt in their legislative councils, and upon whose heads rest the responsibilities of governmental action. The fact that there are more in the government whose wills and actions have stamped upon it this corrupt and despotic character, is only so much the worse. Instead of there being but one ruling despot, as in Russia, there are millions exhibiting the same wanton and reckless disregard of the claims of justice and right—showing that a democratic despotism is more wanton and corrupt than the despotism of a single individual.

The governments of the United States are free in no other sense than is the government of Russia free. The American sovereign is as much born to the throne as the Russian. The only difference is, there are more of them. The American serf is born as voiceless and powerless as the Russian serf, and he is as much subject to the wanton and despotic will of the American sovereign, as is the Russian serf to the Russian sovereign; and the American sovereign is not behind the Russian in the exercise

of his despotic power. The American sovereign is not oppressed, nor is the Russian. The American sovereign is free; so is the Russian.

What is character? What makes it? What denotes it? There is a wide distinction to be made between character and reputation. The character of the individual is the individual selfhood, is the interior nature and quality of the individual, and is always genuine, whether true or false to truth, virtue or justice. The reputation of the individual is the estimation in which he is held by others, and may be true or false. The man who is at heart a villain; whose impulses are in the direction of vice and crime; who respects the rights of his fellow-men only as they minister to his gratification, is base in character, whatever may be his reputation in community. The most corrupt in character may pass for the most virtuous and pure, and thus maintain a false reputation; while, on the other hand, the most upright and just may become the victims of jealousy and oppression. Character is real; reputation is fictitious. Character must be true; reputation may be false.

The individual who will wantonly trespass upon my rights, and appropriate that which is justly mine to his own use, is in character a thief, whatever may be his reputation. The disposition to do the wrong, without a moral power to hold that disposition in check, is what constitutes the thief. A single wanton act of stealing ever so small an amount, as firmly fixes the character upon him as though he had stolen a thousand times, and a thousand times as much. It demonstrates as conclusively that he lacks integrity, and can not be trusted with the property of others in his control, as though it were the business of his life to steal. The individual who will wantonly deprive another of the inalienable rights of man, betrays as utter a disregard of the claims of right and justice, as though he held the whole human family in bondage. That single act of wrong shows that his character is not above the commission of wrong. The individual who will commit a single act of impurity purposely, and for self-gratification, betrays an impure character—one that does not appreciate the value of purity, and therefore one that is not pure. The individual who wantonly and deliberately murders a fellow-

being, is as truly a murderer in character as though he had murdered his thousands; in short, whatever wrong an individual knowingly and willfully does, demonstrates that his character is not above the wrong he commits; and the only question as to whether he will repeat such conduct, depends upon whether he will have a favorable opportunity, without fear of detection or punishment.

So it is with governments. Their character is seen in their acts. If the government will wantonly crush a single individual, despoil him of his inalienable and just rights, that act as firmly establishes its character, as conclusively demonstrates that it does not respect justice and right as of supreme authority, but only as subservient to accidental conditions, as though it despoiled every human being of that which was justly its own. The question whether it will enslave you or me, or whether it will enslave our children, depends for an answer upon the question whether it will find it popular to do it, and not upon any character it has as opposed to slavery. The government which will enslave a single individual, usurps all the authority necessary to enslave the world, and only needs to have that authority accompanied with sufficient power to do so.

And there is no difference in principle between the government of a single despot and the government of a million despots. The single despot usurps no more authority than each individual of the million usurps. The highest authority the single despot can usurp is to exercise the right of controlling the destinies of his subjects without regard to their wishes or the claims of justice; that is, to place himself above the rights of man, and dispose of them according to his own sovereign will and pleasure, regarding that will and pleasure as the highest law, and one to which all others must submit and yield implicit obedience. The million despots usurp the same authority over their subjects, place their combined will above the rights of man and the claims of justice, regarding this as the highest law, and one to which all others must submit.

What does Russian despotism demand and do, that American does not? What false principle enters into the Russian government that is not found in the American? Does the Russian despot

claim that he is born to the throne, and entitled to rule over his subjects according to his own sovereign will and pleasure? So does the American. The American sovereign claims that he inherited his right to supreme authority on the American throne, from his fathers; that he was born to rule, and to rule in the absolute sense in which the Russian claims to rule, over the rights, liberties and lives of his disfranchised subjects. Does the Russian despot claim that he derived from God and his father the right to place his edicts above the claims of justice and the rights of man? So do the American despots, the self-constituted sovereigns of the nation. They claimed their fathers had the right to reject all other authority, and establish a government for themselves, constituting themselves sovereigns over the rights and liberties of others, and making that constitution obligatory upon the world, and making it lawful and right under it, to enslave and crush those who were not consulted in its formation; that they are the children of these self-constituted sovereigns, and born into the rights of their fathers, born to rule with absolute and controlless power over the lives, liberties and fortunes of three million slaves. Has Russia or any other despotism ever usurped higher authority—ever exercised any more absolute dominion over the rights of man?

What does the Russian claim for his edicts, from those whose wills have not been consulted, which the American despot does not? Does he claim anything more than absolute obedience? And will the American despot take anything less? Does he claim any more than that his will, as expressed in his edicts, shall be supreme, and shall override the rights of men and the claims of justice? Do not the American despots demand the same? What though the life, liberty and fortune of the subject must submissively yield to the will of the Czar, must not the life, liberty and fortune of the American subject yield to the will of the American Czars? Examine the history of American legislation, and tell me if it is not characterized by the exercise of the same despotic power?

Is it asked where did the Czar obtain authority for making his will the highest law? I answer, he derived it from the same

source whence the American derived his authority to make his will the law of three million slaves; and the Czar is as rightfully the absolute sovereign of every soul living within his dominion, and has as high a claim to their unqualified submission to his will, as the American sovereign has to the obedience of the three million serfs.

We can come to no other conclusion. The American government, in principle, is as despotic as Russia. In its administration it as willfully and wantonly discards every principle of liberty, and justice and right; it as unblushingly usurps authority, and as despotically exercises it. These are unwelcome truths; but nevertheless they are truths which can not be gainsayed. Those of us who are fortunate enough to occupy the position of sovereigns; who can make our voices heard and our influence felt, are measurably protected. We do not feel the crushing weight of this republican despotism; but those who are less fortunate than ourselves; who are outlawed and proscribed by our despotism, would gladly exchange American for Russian serfdom. Let us be deprived of our political power and influence; let us be separated from the popular sympathy of the day; let the law of republican America make us, our wives and children, subjects of property; let our domestic hearth-stones be invaded, our wives be torn from us, and given to the forced embrace of others, our children placed in the public shambles, and we should entertain a different opinion of the character of our boasted free government. And yet the character of our government needs to undergo no change to bring all this about. She would trample upon no principle of right or justice which she has not been habitually trampling upon since she came into existence, and as became the hereditary despots of America.

The difference between the despotism of Russia and the despotism of republican America is not in principle. They are precisely alike in that respect, and the latter is entitled to no more respect than the former. The American sovereign is no more free than the Russian sovereign, and the American serf is no less a slave than the Russian serf. Their governments are established upon the same foundation. They differ only in the form or man-

ner of their usurpations and oppressions. Both place their institutions or governments above man, and treat him as though he were made for government, and not government for him.

In this respect all human governments are alike, which in practice overlook or discard the principle that the rights of man are superior to all human institutions—that there is and can be no authority under heaven which has a right to conflict with the absolute sovereignty of every individual. Every human government has committed certain fundamental errors, and no matter what form they take, whether despotic, monarchical or republican, they will in principle work out the same result at last, so long as these errors are incorporated into them. The first error consists in the hypothesis that man has authority or power to make or repeal a law. This error leads them to overlook the fact that they are under the dominion of a government which is supreme in its authority and omnipotent in its power, and all that man can do is to change his relations to that government which already exists.

Another error consists in the hypothesis that men can create or destroy rights—that governments can confer power or privileges upon men which they do not naturally possess, or can deprive them of rights or privileges which by nature belong to them. The moment this position is assumed by governments, or conceded by the people, everything is given up, and there is no limit in principle to which usurpation and oppression may not be carried. Another error consists in the hypothesis that men associated in the capacity of government have authority and rights which do not belong to them in their individual capacity. Another error consists in the hypothesis that governments have to do in regulating the social or commercial intercourse between men. Each of these errors will be examined in due time, and the result of them pointed out.

The foundation for examining the first error was laid in my previous essay on the subject of the "higher law." In regard to the physical condition of man, human governments can only benefit him by enabling him to come into harmonious relations with the laws of his physical well-being; and there are only two ways in which they can do that; first, by instructing him what

those laws are, and what they demand; and second, by protecting him in his efforts to comply with their requirements—by not permitting others to compel him to sustain a false relation to them. Instruction and protection are all a government can do for the benefit of the people. As they can neither create nor suspend any law, their enactments, aside from the instruction they give, are no better than blank paper.

The very hypothesis that men can enact laws and compel obedience to them, is predicated upon the same principle upon which all despotism rests. In representative governments, the majority are said to be entitled to rule, that is, to make laws and compel the minority to submit to them, thus converting the majority into a multitudinous despotism. Their laws may entirely disfranchise the minority and convert them into serfs; and yet they are bound to submit, because it is the will of the majority that they shall be serfs. The authority thus to legislate for the minority is as much usurped by the majority as by any despot. Now no one can deny these positions; hence the conclusion is, that republicanism is a lineal descendant of despotism, and in principle differs nothing from it. The one tyrant may be converted into a million tyrants—that is all the difference; and the republican form of government is only a means by which the wills of the million may be embodied to act as one; and when thus embodied and acting as one, it is as despotic as though it originated in one man. It puts forth the same doctrine of divine right, of inherited power, or of right obtained by conquest; of the supreme authority of its enactments or edicts; of the rights and wishes of the minority being subject to the absolute disposal of the ruling power.

So long as it is claimed that human governments are necessary; and so long as they are so framed as to compel the minority to submit to the will of the majority, right or wrong, willing or unwilling; and so long as the majority, through ignorance or design, are liable to trample upon the rights of the minority, where is the truth in the so often repeated doctrine, that man is invested by his Creator with certain inalienable rights? What becomes of those rights in the minority? What has become of the inalienable rights of the poor chattel slave? If man, on coming

into society, agrees to hold his rights subject to the will of the majority, and by that implied agreement is bound to submit to the deprivation of them, were his rights inalienable? If so, his agreement is not binding upon him; if not, he has alienated his rights, and hence they were not inalienable. According to present notions of government, whether despotic, monarchical or republican, man has no inalienable rights. He can not come into society without binding himself to yield them up to the will of the majority, or to the edicts of the governing power.

There is evidently a mistake somewhere; either man has no inalienable rights, or all human governments are predicated upon false principles. My position is, that all human governments are predicated upon false principles; that the rights and authority of a single individual in his sphere, are superior to all other authorities in that sphere; that man is an individual, sovereign being, and that there is no authority under heaven to conflict with that individuality or sovereignty. He derived it from God —is only responsible to God. But mind the expression. He is sovereign within *his* sphere, not within the sphere of others. If he attempts to go beyond his sphere, and to exercise his sovereignty within the jurisdiction of others, he is exceeding the limits of his authority. His authority is limited by the equal sovereignty and authority of others, for they are as sovereign within their sphere as he is within his; and he has no more right to intrude upon them than they have to intrude upon him.

Now if each individual would keep within his sphere, and never attempt to intrude upon the sovereignty of others, there would be no need of those institutions called human governments; or if each individual were possessed of the means of defending his own sovereignty, it would be unnecessary to establish institutions for protection. Hence we very naturally infer that the whole office of human government is protection—a means of summoning aid to defend individual sovereignty. Now where governments are so framed as to require the surrender of that individual sovereignty, they, in the outset, commit all the mischief they were designed to prevent; and herein is to be found all the evils incident to human governments. This false position is to be found alike in all forms of government; I mean the sur-

render of individual sovereignty. Now, unless governments can be so framed as to protect this sovereignty, they are worse than useless. They become as potent to crush as they should be to protect the individual, and are as liable to be used for crushing as for protecting.

The question then arises, What is the extent of this individual sovereignty which must be protected? The simple answer is, every individual is equally sovereign, and hence has equal rights. Now each individual is entitled to the free use of everything which nature has provided for man, to be exercised in such a way as will not conflict with the same freedom in every other human being; and the rule by which we can determine whether he has exceeded the bounds of his rights and sovereignty, is to inquire should every other human being exercise the same right, would there be any conflict? If there would be, he has overstepped the limits of his sovereignty; if there would not be, he has not. The rule is simple and easy of application, and about which there need be no diversity of opinion. Thus, if a man finds a piece of land unoccupied and unappropriated by the labor and improvements of another, he enters upon it, and by his labor improves and appropriates to his own use so much of it as he can actually use. Has he a right to do so? If he has, no one has a right to disturb him. The simple question is, should every other individual exercise the same right, would there be any conflict? The whole world must answer No. Then the individual has not exceeded his sovereignty. He has taken a position he has a right to maintain against the world, individually and collectively; and whatever authority attempts to interfere with him, is acting upon the principle that might makes right—the fundamental principle of despotism.

But take another position: Should an individual appropriate an indefinite quantity of land to himself, without any reference to his ability to use it, and claim the right to exclude every other being from entering upon it and using it, should that same right be exercised by every other human being, would there be any conflict? The whole world must answer, Yes. Then the individual is claiming that which is not his; he has overstepped the limits of his sovereignty, and there is no just authority on earth

to defend him in it; and whoever enters upon any unoccupied and unimproved portion of such land, and by his toil improves and appropriates it to his use, is lawfully exercising his own sovereign right, and trespassing upon the rights and sovereignty of no one.

So much for man's right to that which nature has provided for his use. Again, man has a full and indisputable right to the use of all his physical powers and mental faculties within the sphere of his sovereignty; that is, he is entitled to the products of his own labor, to be used for his own benefit, to be kept or parted with according to his own sovereign will and pleasure. This right is only limited by the claims of those who, by his own volitions, are made dependent upon him, and nature has implanted in his breast impulses which make it a part of his sovereign will and pleasure to make such provisions, so that this is only an apparent and not a real exception.

Such, then, is the nature and sphere of man's sovereignty, and it is above any and all human authority. No man or number of men have any just authority to interfere with its exercise, and no government which requires that any portion of this sovereignty shall be yielded up, is founded upon correct or just principles. That government only is a free one which recognizes and protects, to the last extent, in every individual, this sovereignty. Every other human government is despotic, no matter in what form it exists, or by what name it is called. The whole end and aim of a legitimate human government is to protect each individual in the enjoyment of his inalienable rights; and whenever it steps beyond that, and attempts to create or confer artificial rights and privileges, it is transcending the scope of its authority, and defeating the end of its existence. It then becomes an instrument of oppression, and assumes the character of a despotism.

There are no rights in existence which do not belong to man as an individual, and those rights can not be separated from the individual. He may be deprived of the power to exercise them; but nevertheless they are his, and belong not to another. Governments can not create rights; hence, when by legislative enactments they attempt to confer rights upon individuals, if they accomplish anything, that is, if they give the individual any additional rights, they do so at the expense of others. All that is

given to A is plundered from B, and the act that does it is despotic.

All the inhabitants of the world united together for the purposes of a government, have no more authority over the sovereignty of the individual than a single person. Rights are based upon higher authority than numbers. A million cyphers added together amount to nothing. If A as an individual has no authority to interfere with my personal sovereignty, or deprive me of my rights; and if B. C. and D., etc., to the sum of all mankind, have not individually that right or authority, add them all together, and how much authority do they collectively possess, individually possessing none? The amount of their authority would be expressed by the value of so many cyphers, which would be absolutely nothing. Human governments then possess no authority over the sovereignty or rights of man. The only element they possess is power—brute force. By that they can defend or destroy. When used for defense they may be supported; when used for destruction, they should be destroyed.

The only legitimate end of human government being protection of individual rights and individual sovereignty, they can exercise no authority the individual is not at liberty to exercise. They can only act when the sovereignty of the individual is invaded, and then only for the purpose of protecting that sovereignty, and the individual can not be deprived of that right. The government, in all its action, must be limited by the legitimate end to be accomplished. The government has no authority beyond the authority of the individual. The only thing in which it is superior is in its power. A government has no more authority to be despotic than a single individual; but it has more power to be; that is all the difference.

Governments having legitimately no more authority than the individual, have no rights separate from the individual. If A has no right to monopolize the soil beyond his actual use and occupation, he can confer no such right upon the government. If an individual has not authority to deprive me of my right to enter upon unoccupied and unimproved land, and occupy and improve it for my own benefit, governments have no such right. Individuals not having the authority can not delegate it; and when governments exercise that authority, they do it by virtue of their power—brute force, and not in virtue of any right or le-

when governments exercise that authority, they do it by virtue of their power—brute force—and not in virtue of any right or legitimate authority; and the government that assumes to do it is a despotism, and acts in virtue of its despotic power.

The individual in the exercise of his sovereignty being entitled to the fruit of his own labor as against the whole world, and being at liberty to retain or part with it upon such terms as he and his fellow-sovereign can agree, is not to be controlled in his property relations by the action of human governments. So long as he keeps within the sphere of his own sovereignty, he is not accountable to any human authority. Therefore human governments have no authority to interfere with the business transactions of individuals, and the moment they attempt it they usurp authority and become despotic. Human governments can exercise no such authority, because there is no power to delegate to them such authority. Men can only delegate such authority as they individually possess, but they as individuals have no more authority to deprive me of the fruit of my toil, than I have to do the same by them.

As the end of human governments should be to protect the individual in his personal sovereignty and rights, and as that sovereignty can only be invaded by *force* or *fraud*, governments should only take notice of *force* and *fraud*. The individual is competent to protect himself in every other respect, and if he does not it will be his own fault. Hence all the action of human governments which attempt to regulate and control the pecuniary and commercial transactions of men are uncalled-for, and worse than useless. If trade were left to itself to be regulated and controlled by its own laws, which are superior to any human enactments, we should have less fluctuation. The revulsions which so often sweep over the commercial world, and prostrate everything in their course, are the result of the natural laws of trade prevailing over the artificial arrangements which human authority and weakness has set up in their stead, and like the mountain torrent, although checked in their operations for a while by their artificial barriers, they will ultimately sweep them away, burying the fortunes of those who have built on the false arrangements in one indiscriminate mass of ruin.

PHENOMENA OF CLAIRVOYANCE.

CONTINUED FROM ARTICLE, "PHILOSOPHY OF NATURE," PAGE 468.

WHEN I sit down to exert a mesmeric influence upon the person of another, the question of success will depend upon the state of mental and vital harmony between us, the positive or active state of my own mind, and the passive or negative state of the mind of the subject; and every influence by which I am surrounded at the time will be favorable or unfavorable as they shall tend to create or destroy harmony between us—give me concentrated mental activity, or the subject quiet undisturbed passiveness.

If there is mental and vital harmony between the operator and subject, let the operator assume a strong positive condition, and the subject a negative one, and but few moments will be required to induce the mesmeric condition. For like two strings attuned to harmony, and in proximity to each other, as soon as one of these is vibrated, its motion is communicated to the other through the atmospheric undulations, and thus they vibrate together.

If there is not mental and vital harmony between the operator and subject, that harmony must be obtained by the mental and vital action of the operator upon the subject. To produce this harmony, the operator must assume a strong positive condition, analogous to fixing the points of tension of the string A, and the subject should assume a quiet, passive condition, analogous to leaving the points of tension unfixed, as in the string B. Then the operator should concentrate his will upon the subject, holding the subject by the hands, and occasionally making passes with his hands, from the head downward, or rather from the brain outward through the various parts of the body of the subject.

This operation tends to induce a state of mental and vital harmony between the operator and the subject, and if continued long enough, will result in inducing the mesmeric condition. It may take from one to fifty sittings of half an hour or an hour each, before the necessary conditions will be obtained. The length of time required will depend, *first*, on the degree of discordant relation between the operator and subject. *Second*, on the strong positive condition of the operator, and the concentration and energy with which he can bring his will to bear upon the subject. *Third*, upon the passive or receptive state of the subject. *Fourth*, on other surrounding influences which may favor or counteract either or all of the foregoing conditions.

From the foregoing consideration it will be inferred that all persons are more or less subject to mesmeric influence, and in proper hands might be made to exhibit the ordinary mesmeric phenomena. I have often heard persons remark, that they were not subject to mesmeric influence. However honest they may be in that opinion, it is by no means certain of being true. Until they have complied with the foregoing conditions, and have quietly submitted to be operated upon fifty or even one hundred times of an hour each, they can with no propriety affirm that the mesmeric conditions can not be induced in them. There are numerous instances where the subject has been operated upon fifty times or more, before he became sensible of the influence, and yet became a good subject.

The next phenomenon in mesmerism to which we will call the attention of the reader is the sympathetic relation existing between the operator and subject. It is a phenomenon which almost all have witnessed; their sensations are apparently the same. For example, while the subject was in this insulated condition, we have often witnessed experiments of this kind: The operator would taste a variety of objects, such as cloves, cinnamon, pepper, tobacco, aloes, etc., and the subject, although blindfolded, and physically separated from the operator, would never fail to taste whatever the operator tasted. If pain was inflicted upon the operator by pricking any part of the body, by pinching, or by pulling the hair, the subject would experience the same sensations in the same part of the body, etc.

For the purpose of explaining this phenomenon, we must recur to the position, that a cause, to produce an effect, must be connected with the effect produced. This effect is necessarily the result of a change in the condition or relation of the thing affected. But change implies motion and motion implies power, etc. Now, before the sensation can be transferred from the operator to the subject, there must exist between them some medium of communication, and that medium must be continuous between them. And this medium of communication existing between them, must be such in its character that it can be acted upon by the sensations of the operator, and can in turn act upon the sensations of the subject—in the same manner as that which acts as a medium for the transmission of sound must be such as can be acted upon by the sonorous body, and can in turn act upon the physical organism of the ear.

The transmission of sensation from the operator to the subject demonstrates the existence of such a medium. The office that medium performs will determine somewhat the nature of that medium. According to the developments of nature, that principle which was developed before and next to the development of sensation, was vitality, the nature and office of which have been before noticed. The medium developed next after sensation, was mind, so that the nervous medium is connected with vitality on one hand, and with mind on the other. Therefore it is through one of these media these sensations are transmitted from the operator to the subject.

But vitality is not such a medium as can transmit sensation of itself; it is not sufficiently refined and attenuated for that purpose. The only remaining medium, which is connected with the nervous medium, is mind, and hence that must be the medium of transmission. That such a medium exists, can be demonstrated by an indefinite variety of experiments. In fact every experiment in mesmerism, clairvoyance, etc., demonstrates the existence of such a medium.

This medium may be denominated the mental or spiritual atmosphere, and is nothing more nor less than unindividualized Spirit; and extends through all space, and connects every mind in the universe with every other mind, and all with God. It

sustains a similar relation to mind that the physical atmosphere does to the body—that the principle of gravitation does to inert matter, and is a medium of communication between mind and mind, in the disembodied state. It is the atmosphere of the soul.

The physical atmosphere is a type or correspondence of this spiritual atmosphere, and its laws of action and transmission are typical of the laws or modes of action of the spiritual atmosphere. Thus physical or atmospheric harmony is typical or correspondent of spiritual harmony; and by attending carefully to the phenomena of the former, we shall be enabled the better to understand the philosophy of the latter.

The mind sustains to this spiritual atmosphere the relation of a sonorous body to the physical atmosphere; of a luminous body to the medium of light; of a magnetic battery to the medium of magnetism, etc., and communicates its own motions to this medium in a similar way.

Thoughts, feelings, etc., are mental motions, and are awakened in the mind spontaneously, or by the action of something exterior to the mind. In either case, the mental condition is affected or changed, which effect or change is communicated by its motions to this spiritual atmosphere, in a manner perfectly analogous to the communication of the vibratory movement of a sonorous body to the physical atmosphere.

In the physical atmosphere sound is produced by atmospheric undulations. These undulations are a perfect transcript of the undulations of the sonorous body producing them; different sounds are produced by different atmospheric undulations. The undulation or combination of undulations being the same, the sound or combination of sounds will be the same.

So is it in reference to the spiritual atmosphere. The particular thought, sensation or emotion expresses a mental condition peculiar to itself, and is the result of its own peculiar motion. This motion is communicated to the spiritual atmosphere, and is the motion peculiar to that particular thought, sensation or emotion. As in the physical atmosphere the same motion will always produce the same sound, so in the spiritual atmosphere the same motion will always awaken the same thought, sensation or emotion.

When the operator has induced this insulated condition in his subject, the mind of the subject is brought into clear and distinct contact with this spiritual atmosphere, and through this atmosphere is brought into connection or sympathetic relation with the mind of the operator, and in that condition becomes comparatively one with the operator—thinks, feels, and perceives with the operator. Thus, when in this sympathetic relation the operator tastes tobacco, the taste awakens a peculiar sensation which the mind of the operator at once perceives; and this perception of the operator's mind communicates its own peculiar motion to the spiritual atmosphere, which, in turn, communicates the same motion to the insulated mind of the subject; and thus the mental motion of the operator is instantaneously transmitted to the subject, and their mental motions being the same, their thought, sensation or emotions will be the same.

The process of transmitting the sensation from the operator to the subject, is this: The sensation awakened in the operator a mental motion peculiar to such sensation, both as to the agreeableness or disagreeableness, as well as the location of it, etc. This created in the operator a mental condition including all these circumstances, which was daguerreotyped upon the mind of the subject through the action of this spiritual atmosphere, and hence the subject not only felt the same sensation, but he felt it in the same locality, with every other attendant perception of the operator. The action in this case originated in the nervous medium of the operator, then acted upon his mind, then upon the spiritual atmosphere, then upon the mind of the subject, and thence upon the nervous medium again.

By carefully attending to those phenomena indicating this sympathetic relation between the operator and subject, we shall be pretty well established in our conviction of the truth of the foregoing hypothesis. That thousands upon thousands of such sympathetic phenomena are exhibited, can not be denied. That there is a mental or sympathetic medium of communication between the operator and subject, must be admitted by every one at all familiar with mesmeric experiments. That such medium of communication is natural, and exists in perfect harmony with every other principle in nature, and in its mode of action is an-

alogous to other media of communication and transmission, will be the conclusion of every philosophic mind. From the foregoing and many other similar considerations, I have little hesitation in putting forth the above hypothesis as correct, and its truthfulness will become more and more apparent as I proceed with the explanation of other mesmeric phenomena.

The sensations thus transmitted from the operator to the subject, were transmitted through the mind of the operator; and had the proper mental condition existed in the operator, or could it have been made to exist without actually awakening those sensations in the body of the operator, he could have transmitted those sensations to the subject by mere suggestion; that is, the operator could have imagined himself tasting tobacco, and thus thrown his own mind into the same condition as though he were tasting it, and that condition would be as instantaneously transmitted to the subject as though it had been induced in the operator by actually tasting tobacco.

Thus it is that false sensations can be awakened in the subject; that is, he can be made to feel cold or hot, wet or dry, sick or well, according to the volition of the operator. Where the operator is a man of strong mental power, and can concentrate his will and bring it to bear with great energy upon his subject, he can transmit these false sensations by the force of his own silent volitions, provided the subject be sufficiently under his mental influence.

Where the subject is but partially under the mesmeric influence; that is, where there is but slight mental insulation, or where the operator lacks concentration or mental power, in such cases audible suggestion or pantomimic representations are necessary to transmit these false sensations to the subject. The effect of audible suggestion or pantomimic representations is to bring the mind of the subject to the aid of the operator, and thus by the joint action of both minds accomplish the particular result. Thus when the operator tells the subject that a particular thing is hot, and that it will burn his hand, the mind of the subject, in consequence of the suggestion, awakens the sensation of heat, and co-operates with the operator in producing it. In another place we shall have occasion to speak of the power of mind on

the vital and nervous system of the individual, and therefore will not enter at large upon it in this place.

The power which the joint action of the operator's and subject's mind have over the nervous system of the subject, is very great. This has often been witnessed in those experiments sometimes denominated biological, when the operator, by suggestion, could awaken any sensation, pleasurable or painful, in the subject which he desired; and those sensations could be continued for an indefinite period of time, and during the period of their continuance their effect upon the system of the subject would be the same as though the sensations were real. A glass of water, by the mere will and suggestion of the operator, can be converted into a glass of brandy, and when drank by the subject, will awaken the same sensation of taste, burning the throat and stomach, and will produce the same intoxicating effect as though it were in reality brandy.

Again: By the will and suggestion of the operator, the subject can be made to fancy himself in imminent danger; he may be pursued by a lion, or some animal which will surely destroy him, and every way of escape may be hedged up. In his extreme terror, the blood will leave the surface and rush in upon the heart, and unless the magic word "all right," be speedily pronounced, the subject will be in danger of dying from fright. We have experimented with individuals, when the utmost caution was necessary to be observed, to avoid fatal results. By the mere force of will and suggestion we could cause the blood to rush to the brain, or to the heart; we could cause the subject to leap and sing for joy, or weep and wring his hands in agony of grief; we could cause him to pant and sweat under a tropical sun, or freeze and shake amid polar ice.

Now we need not remark that all these effects are the result of the action of the mind upon the nervous and vital system of the subject; and the action of the mind is real, whatever may be said of the imaginary causes which have produced that action. These phenomena are often said to be the result of imagination. That may be true; but what is this imagination which has such controlless power over the human body? What is this *real* existence denominated imagination? It is as real an existence and as real

an action, as any other existence or action. If by the term imagination the action of the mind be meant, then is imagination as real and true as any other existence. But if by imagination we mean the cause which has called the mind into action, then indeed may imagination be true or false. But in either view of the case, the effect produced upon the subject is the result of the action of the mind upon the vital and mental system ; and whether that mind has been stimulated to action by truth or falsehood, does not affect the question under consideration at all, for in either case the effect has been produced by mental action.

This leads us to inquire, what are these sensations which are thus produced ? We know physiologically, that the nervous system is necessary as a means for transmitting sensations from the exterior or material world to the mind. We also know physiologically, that if the nerves of sensation are separated from the brain, no sensation can be transmitted along those nerves to the mind. Hence, if the nerves which connect my hand with the brain be severed, although my hand be cut or burned no sensation is experienced, thus showing that the sensation is not in my hand but in or near the brain, and although the sensation appears to be in my hand, it is a false appearance.

The reason why the sensation appears to be in my hand when it is injured is, that the nerves connecting any portion of my hand with the brain maintain their individuality even to the brain, and do not become confounded or blended with the nerves from any other part of my hand or system ; and the sensation transmitted along that nerve is associated by the mind with that portion of the system where that nerve comes to the surface to receive or transmit the sensation. Hence if that nerve could be reached at any other place between the hand and brain without disturbing any other nerve, the sensation would appear to be in the hand. For this reason it is, that persons having lost a hand or a leg, continue to feel pain in their fingers and toes, long after they have ceased to possess them. The nerves formerly connecting those fingers and toes with the brain still exist, and transmit sensation to the brain, which the mind by habit associates with the fingers and toes.

From the foregoing, we should conclude that the various sensations are but so many different conditions or states of the mind, usually induced by causes acting upon it through the nervous system. But whenever that particular state of the mind can be induced without the agency of the nervous system, sensations peculiar to that state of mind will be induced, and will have the same effect upon the system, as though they were induced in the ordinary way. Danger, which is revealed to the mind through the instrumentality of the senses, awakens in the mind fear and apprehension. Now that which is to effect the system is the fear and apprehension of the mind, without reference to the cause which has awakened that state of the mind, and that fear and apprehension will have the same effect upon the system, whether it be induced by a real or an imaginary cause.

Thus is it with these psychological phenomena sometimes denominated biological; the sensations awakened exist in the mind of the subject, and are as real as any other sensations; that is, the state or condition of the mind is the same whether induced by real causes revealed to the mind through the instrumentality of the senses, or by imaginary ones, impressed upon it by the volition and suggestion of another mind through the spiritual atmosphere. Hence the false or delusive sensations attending psychological experiments, are real states or conditions of the mind induced by the will and suggestion of the operator. The manner in which these states or conditions are induced, have been before explained.

The next class of phenomena to which your attention is invited is that of thought-reading, sometimes denominated sympathetic clairvoyance. Instances of this kind are very common, and familiar to all who have experimented in mesmeric phenomena. That the faculty in the subject of reading the thoughts, and perceiving the feelings of those by whom they are surrounded, is often induced by mesmeric experiments, can not be denied. It is not the object of this article to demonstrate that phenomena of this kind exist, or to cite numerous cases where they have been manifested; but only to give what we conceive to be the philosophy of these phenomena. With those who yet remain to be convinced of the existence such phenomena, we have nothing to do.

It will be remembered that the mind of the subject is in an insulated condition, and in intimate connection with this atmosphere of the mind. That in this insulated condition, it is free from the sensorous influences of the body, and consequently undisturbed by them. In this condition it can perceive the slight motions or undulations of the spiritual atmosphere; and as the mind sustains to this spiritual medium the relation of a sonorous body, and as the thoughts or emotions of the mind communicate their precise motion to this atmosphere, the insulated mind clearly perceives those motions, and thus becomes acquainted with the thoughts and motions producing them.

The manner in which these thoughts are transmitted from one mind to the other, has already been alluded to. Nevertheless it may be proper to further illustrate that point in this connection. The methods of conversing by the use of vocal language, and by thought merely, are not essentially different in the principles involved in each operation. In the physical atmosphere, sound is produced by atmospheric undulation, and words, constituting vocal language, are but combinations of those undulations. These words, in themselves considered, have no natural meaning; and, separated from the thoughts or ideas associated with them, would awaken no definite mental motion. But to constitute vocal language, we have first the atmospheric undulation which is but the external form, or lifeless carcase of the language. With this external form, we associate an internal or spiritual signification. Habit and association infuse into the word the living thought, the real power which awakens thought and feeling in the mind. Without the thought or idea thus associated, the physical word would be meaningless, lifeless, powerless. Thus we may listen a discourse in any foreign language, unknown to us, without perceiving one of its thoughts, because we have not learned what particular thoughts or ideas to associate with the words used. All the significance there is in vocal language, consists in the mental association of particular thoughts, etc., with particular sounds.

Thus words are messengers or vehicles of thought; and different languages are characterized by the different structure or style of those vehicles which convey the same thought. Thus in English, French or Spanish, the idea of a hat is the same, in its

use or design. Yet the physical word by which it is represented is totally different in each language. But these different words are nothing different but combinations of atmospheric undulations, which mean nothing of themselves. They can awaken no definite thought in the mind, unless we are first taught what thought or idea should be associated with the sound. And the thought or idea thus awakened, is the result of mental action, exercising the power of association.

In brief, conversation by vocal language is this: The mind clothes an atmospheric undulation or combination of undulations with a particular thought, which constitutes the mental power of that undulation, and sends it forth to communicate that thought to the next mind with which it comes in contact. The undulation, thus freighted with thought, moves on until it comes in contact with the tympanum of a listening ear; the thought or idea alone passes on to the mind; the undulation dies upon the outside of the ear—like force communicated to a ball, the ball moves on until it meets with a resisting body, then communicates its force and falls to rest.

Thus it will be perceived, that words constituting vocal language, are but signs of ideas, not ideas themselves; and that the significance of vocal language, after all, consists in the silent thought associated with the words used, and is purely mental. The cogital undulation awakened in the mind, by hearing the word pronounced, does not differ in principle from the cogital undulation awakend spontaneously, or by reflection, when no word is pronounced.

Thought-reading or sympathetic clairvoyance then consists in this: The mind of the subject being insulated from the sensuous influences of the body, and consequently undisturbed by them, is brought into clear and distinct contact with this spiritual atmosphere, and can perceive the slight motions or undulations in that atmosphere. These motions are occasioned by the action of those minds about the subject, and are a perfect transcript of those mental motions. These motions of the spiritual atmosphere, strike upon the mind of the subject and are thus transferred, and awaken the same motion in it. Now trace the operation. The mind about the subject thinks. Those thoughts are

mental motions, and awaken precisely the same motion in the spiritual atmosphere. The motions in this atmosphere strike upon the mind of the subject, and awaken precisely the same motion therein, and thus the same motions exist in both minds. Now the mental motions being the same, the thoughts or ideas will be the same, and thus the subject is enabled to read the thoughts of those about him.

It will be perceived that, in this condition, the subject converses only by thought, and not by means of written or spoken language. Therefore, while in this condition, it matters not what may be the external form of the language used by those conversing with the subject, the mental motion occasioned by the thought or idea associated with the form is what the clairvoyant perceives. Hence, in this condition, the subject can converse in any language which the mind present understands. This fact was most beautifully illustrated several years since, by experiments made with a clairvoyant in the presence of Jenny Lind. In the normal condition the clairvoyant knew nothing of music; she knew no language but the English, and that indifferently; yet when in the mesmeric condition and *en rapport* with Jenny, she would accompany her in her most difficult performances, and so perfectly harmonizing with her, that it was impossible to discover at times the presence of but one voice, except in the double power the two produced. She also accompanied Jenny with equal ease, whether she sang in English, French, Italian, or her own native Swedish. The philosophy of it was as has been described. She was in communication with Jenny through this spiritual atmosphere; and through that communication every thought, feeling or emotion of Jenny instantly became her own. They thought the same thoughts, felt the same emotions, and breathed forth the same music.

The existence of this spiritual atmosphere being known, and the manner in which mental communications are made through it, it will not be difficult to understand how the presence of discordant minds effect unfavorably these experiments. Every mind present gives out those cogital undulations peculiar to its own state or condition; and those undulations are felt by the subject, and tend to awaken the same thoughts and feelings in

him. Now when discordant minds are present, and send out their discordant undulations, they tend to awaken confused and discordant thoughts and feelings in the mind of the subject. Under these circumstances the subject can perceive nothing clearly, while at the same time a conflict of thought and feeling is awakened, and a painful and restless anxiety takes place. Hence arises the difficulty in making these experiments in public, where every variety of mind is present, each exerting its own peculiar influence upon the subject. These experiments can not be performed in the presence of a multitude, unless the subject possesses the power of resisting the influence of surrounding minds, which very few subjects do.

Again, this view of the subject also explains the necessity of surrounding the clairvoyant with harmonious influences. If an experimenter would prosecute successfully these investigations, he should generally be alone with his subject; or if he admits others to witness his experiments, they should be such as would be likely to harmonize with each other, and with the operator. The operator must be able to control the minds about him, if he would successfully experiment with mind; for we can not experiment successfully with electricity, magnetism or any other subject, unless we can control the elements with which our experiments are necessarily connected.

Conversing by means of thoughts and desires, etc., enables the clairvoyant to detect the false-hearted and hypocritical. The desire or intention to commit a crime, or be guilty of any impurity, although concealed from the world in the secret recesses of the soul, sends out its discordant and polluted undulations into the spiritual atmosphere, and truly reflects the character of the individual who cherishes such thoughts and desires; and to the pure Spirit, such a character appears in the same polluted and criminal light as though his secret thoughts had found expression in open crime. Hence, said Christ, "Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery already with her in his heart."

This method of communicating by thought, desire, etc., is the same in manner, from the highest developed intelligence in the universe to the lowest. It is the manner in which disembodied

Spirits communicate with each other, and with persons in the form. This spiritual atmosphere fills all space, and forms a medium of communication between all minds whose states and affinities would lead them to communicate with each other. And as disembodied Spirits converse only by thought, desire, etc., no symbolic or external form of language is necessary. Hence, in the next sphere of existence, all will be able to understand each other according to their states or conditions of development, irrespective of the nation or tongue from which they entered that sphere.

But undeveloped minds can not, from the nature of things, understand those truths belonging to a higher state or condition of development, and must continue in those lower spheres, until by mental action and discipline, they are sufficiently developed to enter the higher spheres. But minds developed into higher spheres can at pleasure pass into all below them, and hold converse with the inhabitants of those lower spheres on all subjects proper, that is, intelligible, to those below them, in the same manner that minds in the form, highly cultivated in the higher branches of mathematics, can converse with pupils in arithmetic, but can not converse with them in algebra, geometry, the calculus, etc., for the mind of the juvenile pupils is not sufficiently developed to understand those higher forms of truth.

After having been developed to a higher state or condition, the mind naturally abides in it, that is, prefers it to a lower sphere, and naturally is attracted to the higher spheres. Hence those of the lower spheres enjoy but little of the society of those of a higher development. Nothing but pure, unselfish love, that is, a desire to aid Spirits of the lower spheres in their development and consequent ascension into higher states, ever draws them into the lower spheres. Their attractions and affinities are in the other direction, and as they develop, that attraction increases in power. The influence which draws them to the lower spheres has its analogy in this life. When you see the high-minded, cultivated, benevolent soul leaving the ranks of the wealthy and worldly noble, and spending his time, and strength, and influence in searching out the abodes of ignorance, wretchedness and poverty, that he may take their inmates by the hand and elevate them, and administer to their necessities and comforts, you

have a feeble illustration of that heavenly principle of love which draws Spirits from their lofty sphere, to instruct, elevate and develop those humble ones to higher mansions in their Father's house.

From the foregoing considerations it is easy to understand how the most secret thoughts of our minds and acts of our lives are open and known to the intelligence of these spiritual spheres, and can not cease to be known. These disembodied minds or Spirits are the volumes in the great library of God, wherein are recorded the minutest transactions of our lives. And herein let all understand, and feel and know, that from God or Spirit nothing can be hid. Let the licentious man and woman understand and know that the secrets of their chambers, as well as the secrets of their hearts, are on perpetual record in the archives of eternity, to be read by all created intelligences. Let every one understand that they can not be alone; that they are constantly attended by the Spirits of the departed dead. Let the widowed husband know that the Spirit of the departed wife watches over him in all his waywardness, and witnesses his infidelity to her virtues and memory, and let the widowed wife understand the same. Let the parent remember that the Spirit of that son or daughter is ever present to witness their virtue or their shame, and let the child understand and feel the watchful presence of departed parents.

In the mesmeric condition there is every degree of mental insulation, from the slightest effect, psychologically considered, to the most perfect state of independent clairvoyance; and these degrees of insulation determine in a great degree the character of the phenomena exhibited. In some of the first stages of insulation, it requires oral or pantomimic suggestion to produce the phenomena. In such cases the mere will of the operator is not sufficient, and the psychological phenomena (usually denominated biological) are more strikingly exhibited while the subject is in these lower stages of insulation. One of the main reasons for this is, in these lower stages of insulation the subject is less influenced by surrounding minds, and there is less to conflict with the will of the operator. Whereas, were the subject more perfectly insulated, he would be more susceptible to the influences

of surrounding minds, which would often tend to defeat the will of the operator.

As mental insulation proceeds, the subject soon enters into the first stages of sympathetic clairvoyance. The mind which the subject first comes into sympathy with, is usually that of the operator. While the state of insulation is very imperfect, the subject perceives only the stronger motions of the spiritual atmosphere, acting most in harmony with its own mind. These motions will, of course, proceed from the mind of the operator, and be felt by the subject. In this condition the subject will not be likely to perceive the presence of other minds, unless directed to do so by the will of the operator. This degree of insulation may be produced by demagnetizing the nerves of sensation, and slightly demagnetizing the brain. But the phenomena exhibited in this state will be mostly of a negative character. The subject may be insensible to pain, or of the presence of persons or objects about him, but will exhibit none of the higher class of mesmeric phenomena.

But as mental insulation proceeds, the subject will come into sympathy with surrounding minds; and if everything is quiet and harmonious, will exhibit the phenomena of thought-reading with astonishing accuracy. Many instances of this kind are taken for independent clairvoyance; in fact, the dividing line between the sympathetic and the independent, is passed so gradually that it is sometimes difficult to tell where the one ends and the other begins. Nevertheless, there is a marked difference between sympathetic and independent clairvoyance, in this: the sympathetic clairvoyant can only perceive those things which are present in the minds of those by whom he or she is surrounded, but does not possess the power of passing away and investigating different persons and places without the aid of minds present, while the independent clairvoyant seems to possess such power.

In the highest state of sympathetic clairvoyance, the subject's mind is not *perfectly* insulated from the sensuous influence of the body. Every mind in the body is more or less connected with the nervous medium, and in its mental action gives motion to

this nervous fluid, which extends from the body into space, and forms a sort of aroma, grosser than the spiritual atmosphere. The motions which affect the mind of the sympathetic clairvoyant are produced as well by the undulations of this nervous aroma as by those of the spiritual atmosphere; and the mind in this sympathetic state can not perceive the undulations of the spiritual atmosphere, unless accompanied by these aromal undulations, because in this state the mind is not perfectly insulated from the nervous influence of the body or brain, and the undulations of the spiritual atmosphere alone do not act with sufficient power to give clear and distinct motion to the mind not perfectly insulated; consequently the sympathetic clairvoyant can not read those minds, the aromal influence of which does not to some extent include the clairvoyant.

But when mental insulation is perfected, and the mind of the clairvoyant is rendered independent of this aromal influence, then it comes into clear and perfect contact with the spiritual atmosphere, and can perceive its slightest motions; then it comes in contact with disembodied Spirits, and can read their thoughts; then, through this atmosphere, it can mentally travel to places remote, and describe persons and scenes far away. In this condition the clairvoyant mind gains access to the great spiritual library, and, according to its development, can read the histories therein written.

After the mind has thus become insulated, and brought into clear and distinct contact with the spiritual atmosphere, and also in contact with disembodied mind, it learns much of what it reveals to us through these minds. Thus distant objects or individuals are frequently seen by reflection from minds inhabiting the spiritual atmosphere. As for illustration: A clairvoyant in the city of Cleveland wishes to examine an individual in the city of London. The mind of the clairvoyant does not necessarily travel to London while the body remains in Cleveland, nor does it, in point of space, necessarily leave the body at all; but by being in contact with the spiritual atmosphere, it may perceive the individual in London through disembodied mind inhabiting this medium. Thus the mind of the individual in London is in con-

tact with this atmosphere, and through it is impressed on disembodied mind, which in turn impresses it upon the mind of the independently clairvoyant.

Past events are not unfrequently made to assume the appearance and reality of the present. And here is one source of error the independently clairvoyant are very liable to fall into. In fact, the clairvoyant should be very careful to learn to correct these errors; for it not unfrequently happens, when he is examining distant events, the future and the past rise up and become one present. If the clairvoyant in such cases would look about, he would find himself attended by a guide, who would be able able and willing to make the necessary corrections, and tell him what was past, present and future, for it is the presence of such a guide that is bringing back the past, and revealing to him the future.

PROPOSITION.

ALL sin consists in coming into, and continuing and acting in, such conditions and relations as bring the individual in some department of his being, under the action of a law not suited to ultimating the perfect destiny of such individual.

Hence sin begets no new action in respect to the power punishing it, but brings the sinner into a condition and relation where the law can only act to punish.

Hence, if the power is omnipotent to bless when in true condition and relation, it must, by the same power, curse whatever is in false relation and condition; for there is but one true condition and relation under which the power can act to bless. All others must antagonize.

PROPHECIES OF NOSTRADAMUS.

THAT in every period of the world's history preceding the close of the first century of the Christian era, there were certain persons endowed with supersensuous discernment, and with the faculty of foretelling future events, is a fact established by historical records, the validity of which is recognized throughout Christendom. This being admitted, the authority on which it has come to be believed, in latter days, that all prophetic powers and other spiritual gifts were entirely withdrawn from mankind at the close of the apostolic age, is subject to a reasonable question even on *a priori* grounds. For if the prophetic faculty was ever enjoyed by the favorably constituted and favorably conditioned human mind, why may it not be enjoyed by similarly constituted and conditioned minds in all ages of the world, and at the present day as well as three thousand years? There is certainly nothing in ancient biblical teaching which necessarily limits the continuance of the prophetic gift to any particular period, but much which, by implication if not positive assertion, gives promise that this as well as other spiritual gifts should be continuous with those whose inner life is not too much obscured by an unfavorable bodily organism, or by an absorption in the materialities of the outer world. And certainly the writings of the Christian fathers, during the first three centuries of our era, are not wanting in the most positive testimonies to an unbroken continuance of these spiritual gifts, as might be shown by abundant quotations were this the proper place; and that even in the darker ages and more degenerate conditions of humanity which ensued, there were, especially among the monks, the eremites, and other religious *solitaires*, occasional instances of the exercise of a prophetic sense, is a fact based upon historical testimony as

valid as that on which rests the genuineness of the book of Daniel. Passing over many instances which might be quoted in illustration of this remark, it is simply our purpose at present to lay before our readers, from the pages of Dickens' *Household Words*, a translation of some prophecies of Nostradamus which seem plainly to refer to the affairs of the French nation from the beginning of the present century onward.

Nostradamus, it may be premised, was born in the year 1503, at St. Remy, in Provence. Naturally possessed of more than ordinary mental powers, and industriously applying himself to study during the years of his youth, he afterward became distinguished for learning, and for his skill in the practice of medicine. But losing his wife at an early age, and in vain essaying to dissipate his grief by travel, and being, moreover, annoyed by the persistent animosity of professional rivals, he retired into solitude, and afterward developed the alleged prophetic faculty which has given him his historical distinction. He wrote his predictions in obscure verse, and collected and published them in the year 1555, under the title of "PROPHETIC CENTURIES;" and the subsequent fulfillment of some of them made him the center of attraction to many illustrious personages. This book of Nostradamus afterward fell into obscurity, but was regarded with much interest by certain minds during the fore part of the present century, and by Napoleon himself among the number, on account of its evident foreshadowing of events then transpiring. In 1840, it was republished by Mons. Bareste. The translation given in "Household Words" is of that portion of the prophecies which is regarded as relating to the events of French history from the beginning of the present century to this time, the vision extending somewhat into the future. It will be impossible for any intelligent person not to see their appositeness of actual occurrence to these predictions, which here follow:

F.

"Gallic Italy will see, far from her bosom, the birth of a supernatural being (Napoleon). That man will come out quite young from the sea (Island of Corsica); will come to acquire tongue and manners from the Celtic Gauls; will open, still young, through a thousand obstacles among the soldiers, a path, and will become their first chief. That winding path will leave him many griefs. He will come to war near his land for a luster

or more. Beyond the sea he will be warring with great glory and valor, and will subdue afresh the Roman world.

" Will give laws to the Germans, will pacify the troubles and fears of the Gallic Celts, and will then be named not king but imperator, by grand enthusiasm of the people.

" Will battle in all parts of the empire; will chase princes, and lords, and kings, for two lusters or more. Then he will call to life new princes and lords, and, speaking on his estrade (raised dais) shall cry, 'O sidera—O sacra!' Will be seen with an army numbering forty-nine times twenty thousand foot soldiers, armed, who will carry arms and horns of irons. He will have seven times seven thousand horses, mounted by men who will carry, in addition to the former, great lance or sword, and body armor of brass. He will have seven times seven thousand men, who will play terrible machines, and will vomit sulphur and fire and death. The total amount of his army will be forty-nine times twenty thousand men. Will bear in his right hand an eagle, sign of the victory to win. Will give many countries to nations, and to each one peace. Will come into the great city, ordaining many great things, buildings, bridges, harbors, aqueducts, canals; will do, himself alone, by great riches, as much as a Roman, and all in the dominion of the Gauls. Will have two wives and one son. Will go warring to where the lines of longitude and latitude cross, fifty-five months. There his enemies will burn with fire the great city, and he will enter there and depart from thence with his men, from under ashes and great ruins; and his men, having no longer either bread or water, through great and extreme cold, will be so unfortunate that two-thirds of his army will perish, and, moreover, the half of the remainder being no longer in his dominion.

" Then the great man abandoned, betrayed by his friends, will be chased in his turn, with great loss, near to his native soil, by the great European population. In his place will be put the kings of the old blood of the Capet.

He, forced into exile in the sea from whence he came so young, and near to his native soil, remaining for eleven moons with some of his men, true friends and soldiers, and not amounting to more than seven times seven times seven times two times in number. Immediately the eleven moons are past, will he and his men take ship and set foot on the Celto-Gallic land.

" And he will march to the great city where is seated the king of the old blood of the Capet, who rises, flees, carrying off with him royal ornaments. Puts kings in his ancient domination. Gives his people many admirable laws.

" Then, cleared away again by a three-fold European population (par trinité population Européenne) after three moons, and

the third of a moon. The king of the old blood of the Capet is put back in his place; and he, believed to be dead by his people and soldiers, who during that time will keep his memorial on their breasts. The Celts and Gauls, like tigers and wolves, will destroy each other. The blood of the old king of the Capet will be the plaything of black treasons. The discontented will be deceived, and by fire and sword put to death; the lily maintained; but the last branches of the old blood still menaced.

“So they will quarrel among themselves.”

“Up to this point,” says the writer in *Household Words*, “the prophecy seems to point to the fortunes of Napoleon, the old Bourbons, and the commencement of Louis Philippe’s reign. But now comes the end of it. After the mutual animosity of the old and young blood of the Capet, and the discontent of the French nation, we may suppose ourselves arrived at the end of 1848.”

“Then a new combatant will advance toward the great city *** He will bear lion and cock on his armor. Then the lance will be given him by a great prince of the East. (Ainsi la lance lui sera donnée par un grand prince d’Orient.)

“He will be marvelously seconded by the warlike people of Gaul, who will unite themselves to the Parisians to put an end to troubles; collect soldiers, and cover themselves with branches of olives.”

“The new combatant, whoever he is,” says the *Household Words*, “who comes in so apropos to put an end to civil dissension, is evidently supported by the soldiers—no less than by the people of Gaul—he bears for his cognizance a lion and a cock; which, without any great stretch of ingenuity, may be taken to represent an alliance between France and England; and immediately on this being arranged, a lance is given him by the great prince of the Orient. We may venture to interpret this, “a cause of war is furnished to the allied Lion and Cock, by the Sultan of Turkey.” External glory, is however, to be followed by great calamities at home. Peace is only to endure for twenty five moons.

“In Lutetia (Paris) the Seine, reddened with blood (the consequence of struggles to the death) will widen its bed with ruin and mortality. New seditions of discontented maillotins (factions). Then they will be chased from the palace of the kings by the man of valor; and afterward the immense Gauls declared by all the great and metropolitan nation.

“And he, saving the ancient remains of the old blood of the Capet, rules the destinies of the world, makes himself sovereign council of every nation and people; lays foundation of fruit without end—and dies.”

PROGRESS OF RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

AMONG the hopeful signs of the times none are perhaps more conspicuous than that which consists in the steady progress of religious liberty throughout Christendom and the civilized world. The time is within the memory of many beside "the oldest inhabitants," when the established "orthodoxy," even in our own comparatively free land, was the authority by which the fate of any new theological idea was irrevocably fixed; and all thoughts or doctrines which did not conform to its prescribed standard, were made the occasion of consigning their originators to ignominy. But noble minds have rebelled against the rule of their supercilious dictators, and asserted their freedom, and maintained it. Stern was the conflict waged between the rights of conscience and the usurped powers of theological restrictionists. Slowly and steadily has the latter force yielded to the developing omnipotency of the former, until, at the present time, almost any opinion may be avowed on religious subjects, without seriously compromising the social standing or external interests of the one who avows them; and judging from present tendencies, the time would appear not far distant when every mental barrier now existing in the form of ecclesiastical proscription, shall be swept away by the overwhelming tide of free thought.

As if a sphere of living divine energy had been sent down from heaven enveloping the whole earth, and inspiring the long crushed soul of man to arise and assert its dignity, we find that there are now distinct incipient unfoldings of religious toleration and free investigation apparent in lands hitherto regarded as doomed to almost hopeless mental bondage. Even stagnant creed-bound Turkey, which for centuries has been chained to the

Koran as an only and sufficient mental guide, is breaking loose from its thraldom, and exercising the right of free thought. This freedom, indeed, is guaranteed by a recent firman issued by the Sultan. Intelligent minds are becoming skeptical as to the truth and authority of their national religion. The Christian Scriptures are freely purchased and perused by them; and there is little doubt that their freely unfolding rational powers will ultimately be adequate to the elaboration, from the materials furnished by all ages and nations, of a consistent eclectic system which will embrace the elements of progress and elevation so lamentably absent from the teachings of the Arabian prophet, as now interpreted.

The spirit of the Romish Church, avowedly intolerant to that which opposes its creeds, is gradually being forced to relax the rigidity of its behests. Railroads, magnetic telegraphs and commerce, the extension of which the influence of a blind and bigoted priesthood has been found inadequate to restrain, are, by promoting inter-communication between different sections and nations, sowing wide the germs of free thought in realms hitherto enveloped in thick mental darkness, and ruled by undisputed sacerdotal authority. Catholicism, consequently, is gradually narrowing the relative circle of her dominion. She propagates almost solely by hereditary transmission, but in free countries does not hand down her creeds beyond one or two generations. The enlightened of Catholic countries, as of France, are becoming generally skeptical as to her faith, and negligent of her forms and ceremonies. In Spain, in Austria, and even in the papal territory itself, she is obliged to rely upon secular force to maintain her authority intact; while the news of any progress in the world of ideas without herself, is heard of with fear and trembling.

But it was our design more especially to speak of a movement which is now in progress in the new Congress in Mexico, and which consists in the introduction of an article in the new Constitution proposed to be adopted, securing toleration to all religious opinions. As was to be expected, this proposition met with vigorous opposition from certain quarters, but still, at the last accounts, the voice of the people, and especially of the more en-

lightened classes, seemed to be decidedly in its favor. It was being advocated with zeal and eloquence by many members of the Congress, and but feebly opposed by others, who simply argued its inexpediency as a *present* measure, on the ground that the masses were not yet prepared for it, and not because it was intrinsically wrong or improper.

If this article in the proposed Constitution is adopted, as it probably will be, and the new government continues long enough to give the people a fair taste of religious liberty, the influence of the papacy in every part of the American continent must inevitably decline, and finally cease altogether. Intelligent and enterprising people will be attracted to Mexico from other parts of the world. Free thought, free speech, a free Press, and all concomitant internal improvements will be permanently inaugurated. No recession toward the former gloom of theological darkness and slavery can ever again occur, and in time Mexico will be a free, enlightened and progressive nation, and as such a pioneer in the march of improvement to her sister republics of the farther South. Whichever way the pending question may be decided, its free discussion at the present time will put in motion a current of thought which will probably not cease until the existing theological despotism is supplanted by a free and more progressive state of things.

F.

PROPOSITION.

THAT existence which individualizes and develops, by appropriating that which is subject to time and space, is liable to come into antagonism with other like individualities in their individualization and development.

Hence all material individualities in the mineral, vegetable and animal kingdoms, are liable to invade each other in their several planes of development.

Hence the laws of their individualization, in respect to each individuality, are liable to appropriate that which the other needs to appropriate, and which can not be appropriated by both, and for the lack of which they must perish.

BUCHANAN'S ANTHROPOLOGY.

Outlines of Lectures on the Neurological System of Anthropology, as discovered, demonstrated and taught in 1841 and 1842. By JOSEPH R. BUCHANAN, M. D., 8vo, pp. 400. Cincinnati: Office of Buchanan's "Journal of Man." For sale by Partridge & Brittan, 342 Broadway, New-York.

IN the brief space now allotted to us, it is impossible to do justice to this important work. It is the result of the researches of a bold, independent, original mind possessed of acute faculties of observation, and rare powers of analysis and synthesis, though a mind which perhaps is not proof against those temptations resulting from an ambition to discover something which has lain beyond the ken of his predecessors.

This book is divided into four parts, designated as, I. Phrenology; II. Cerebral Physiology; III. Pathognomy, and IV. Sarcognomy.

In the part devoted to Phrenology, the author criticizes the system which, under that name, was originated by Dr. Gall and improved by his disciple Dr. Spurzheim, and which he thinks is encumbered by many errors and imperfections. These Dr. B. proposes to rectify by a substitution of his own theories deduced principally from neurological experiments upon the different parts of the brain. Dr. B.'s enthusiasm in setting forth the claims of his *eureka* has, we think, led him to slightly overlook and belittle the true merits of the system of his predecessors in phrenological science; and his assaults upon the supposed weak points in that system, though undoubtedly sometimes effectual, do not appear to be always well sustained. We can not rid ourselves of the impression that the part of Dr. B.'s mode of

phrenological investigation which consists in the magnetic excitation of different portions of the brain, and an observance of the mental phenomena which ensue as being the exponents of the functions of the respective organs that have been touched, is too fallacious to be made the basis of any conclusions which are not strongly confirmed by collateral facts and circumstances. The magnetic or "neurological" polarities of the brain are in such delicate equipoise that a disturbance by the application of the finger to one part of the cranium may, for aught we know, change the polarity of, and thus powerfully affect, a remote region of the brain, in which case of course the resultant mental manifestation would be no indication of the function of the organ that had been touched. Nevertheless, Dr. B.'s *critique* upon the Gallian system is, upon the whole, deserving of deep consideration; whilst many of the new facts and philosophizings developed in his investigation are indispensably important to a thorough knowledge of the science, and will yet receive the respectful attention of all progressive phrenological investigators.

Incidental to the series of experiments by which Dr. B. elaborated his peculiar system of phrenology, he was led to the discovery of the power and phenomena of PSYCHOMETRY. For its philosophical and practical bearings, and for the important light which it throws upon the deeper mysteries of the human soul and its sympathetic connections with all things in the natural and spiritual worlds, we regard this as among the most important of the results of his investigations, and indeed as among the most important discoveries of the age by whomsoever made. A brief exposition of the principles and methods of psychometry is contained in the 28th and 29th chapters of the present work; but the processes by which he made his discoveries in this department, and the phenomena by which the claims of the science are verified, are more fully detailed in the first volume of his *Journal of Man*.

The following extract from our author's 36th Lecture will suggest a source of amusing, and for aught we know to the contrary, truthful speculation which is within the reach of every one. The Lecture is entitled "Chirognomy, meaning the art of judging of a man's character by the appearance of his hand-writing: r.

The principles of chiognomy are strictly mathematical, and although in their application there is great room for the exercise of tact, and for those bold efforts of genius which reach at one leap the conclusion of innumerable mathematical processes—still the rules are but few and simple. It is but a special application of the general principles of Pathognomic science which has been stated. Every cerebral organ acts in the line in which its fibers point; every muscular action, in obedience to a cerebral organ, is in that line. The problem which chiognomy presents to us is this: How are the pathognomic lines manifested in the movements of the pen?

To solve this problem we must fancy the individual engaged in the act of writing, and sitting in a certain position, in reference to the paper. Let him occupy the ordinary position of a writer—his paper before him, his head slightly drooping, his hand moving in accordance with the lines then operating. In this position, the lines of intellectual action will give upon the paper a progressive movement. More especially is this true of the intuitive, perceptive and prescient intellect. It follows then that clear, strong and vivid mental action will be indicated by an open progressive style—the letters advancing across the paper, and the spontaneous or incidental movements of the pen tending forward. The termination of each letter has a progressive appearance, and does not turn back or descend. Hence, under the most vivid intellectual excitement, when the ideas anticipate the rapidity of the pen, a few words stretch across the page, and the termination of each word frequently runs on into the beginning of the next, thus making a continuous connection. But when we write more deliberately, with a paucity of ideas, our letters are more fully formed and less expansive. In unintellectual persons, and those who are governed by the occipital organs, the writing, instead of spreading across the page, becomes cramped and crowded together, devoid of the open, advancing style which is characteristic of intellect.

Moreover, in the chiography of the intellectual man, there are generally a clearness, grace and facility, which strike us at the first glance. These qualities, however, are entirely distinct from the mechanical beauty of the well-trained penman—as distinct as the bearing of the refined lady from that of the drilled soldier. This intellectual elegance it is impossible to describe by words; it must be learned from observation.

The general pathognomic tendency of the intellectual organs upon paper, may be represented by a horizontally advancing line, that of the reasoning intellect slightly elevated above the horizontal, and that of the perceptive organs slightly depressed—the

tendency of these organs being to adhere closely to the lines upon which we write, neither descending much below, nor rising much above. The moral organs tend entirely above this line, and generally manifest their influence by giving elevation to the writing. They produce no long and heavy strokes below the line, but give altogether a light impression. Their antagonists, the animal organs, manifest themselves below the line, and by a heavy impression. The lines of the two classes are exactly opposite—the moral line being upward, light and vanishing; the animal line, downward, heavy, and emphatic. It is therefore a prepossessing circumstance to observe the pen moving freely above the line; and an objectionable feature when the tails of letters below the line are elongated and heavy.

Not only do the tops and tails of the letters indicate the moral or animal forces; but in the spontaneous movement of the pen, in the termination of each letter, and in the gratuitous flourishes or dashes, we observe the predominant tendency. The animal organs give a tendency to finish each word by a downward or backward movement, the moral to finish it by a light ascending stroke. When the animal organs are inactive or overruled for the time by the moral, the upward movements preponderate so greatly over the downward, that the writing ascends above the line, or manifests a continual disposition to climb toward the top of the paper. In the opposite case there is a downward tendency, and the words frequently fall below the line, or the line of writing descends from its origin.

The pathognomonic line of Benevolence, Religion, and Firmness, is upward and advancing, Benevolence being the most progressive, which is nearly allied to the Intellectual Organs. The line of Love, Hope, and Integrity, is more nearly vertical. The lines of Cautiousness, Sublimity, and Reverence point upward and backward, and thus tend to give a round, erect, open character to the writing. Ideality has a similar tendency, but is not marked by bold or elongated lines; its movements are light, small, and delicate. The lines of Fear and Secretiveness tend directly backward, the former being heavier than the latter. The effect of organs which point backward, when their own movements are not conspicuously displayed, is frequently shown in preventing forward movements, and giving the writing a more compact character. Profligacy, Destructiveness, and Combativeness, tend backward and below the line. The region of Hatred and Violence tends generally downward, and bears upon the pen more heavily than the Selfish or Combative Region. The movements downward and forward indicate Restlessness, Arrogance, Disgust, and Impulsiveness.

WORSHIP.

THERE is inherent in every human being a demand for worship. This demand is indicated among all the nations of the earth by their various religious rites and ceremonies. Few indeed have been found who were so low in the scale of progression as not to give evidence of the existence of this demand. This demand is not accidental or educational, any more than the demand of food to supply the necessities of the physical body. Both are based upon the nature and necessities of that being in which they exist.

This demand for worship is not based upon either the physical or intellectual necessities of man, nor does it originate in either of those natures. Those who are most under the controlling influence of either the physical or intellectual nature feel the least of this demand; and had man no other nature, he would feel nothing of it.

This demand for religious exercise, so universal among mankind, produces the existence of a religious nature in man, as a constituent portion of his being. It proclaims the existence of a nature which must be supplied with that food which is adapted to its being, in order to nourish, strengthen and develop it. It also proclaims another important truth, that this religious nature will be favorably or unfavorably affected according as its demands are properly or improperly complied with.

The demand of the physical body for food proclaims the same truth in respect to itself, as does this demand of our religious natures; and the health and welfare of the body is not indifferent to the kind of food with which its demands are supplied. The mischief incident to an indiscriminate thrusting of crude matter into the stomach would be no greater to the physical

body than an indiscriminate supply of this demand of our religious natures. Its demands may be hushed by any kind of religious exercise which satisfies our highest ideal of worship; but it does not thence follow that the demand has been properly supplied.

The existence of this demand is a solemn truth, challenging the highest and most serious consideration of the immortal being. It is a demand of his highest nature, and has to do with his highest interest and destiny. The physical body may famish and die; the intellectual nature may be undeveloped in this sphere; and still the immortal may repair his loss in another and better sphere; but let the religious nature find out a sickly existence here, and the unfolding ages of eternity alone can sum up the loss.

The soul of man in its inmost being, is so allied to the Divine of the universe, that its demands can not be slighted without an irreparable injury. Its demands have to do with its vital and inmost relations to God, and its demands are based upon those relations. Neglect the soul in its vital relations, and you wound its immortal constitution—you inflict upon it a scar which eternity can not efface. Wound the immortal constitution by indifference to its necessary demands, or by a false compliance therewith, and spiritually you are in a condition analogous to him who, by his lust and dissipation, has undermined his physical constitution, and thus entailed upon his physical body disease and wretchedness during the period of its existence.

A true demand, in its proper sense, implies a need of that which is demanded; and that need must be supplied, or the demandant must suffer more or less permanently, according to the need. Thus hunger is a demand of the physical body for proper nourishment; thirst is a demand for proper fluids. The inquisitive tendency of the mind is a demand for knowledge to lead the intellectual being in the ways of wisdom; so also is the desire of the religious nature for worship a demand of that nature for union and communion with God; and each of these demands must be obeyed, or that department of our being making the demand will fail of attaining what it needs.

But the nature and character of the demand will indicate the

nature and character of that which is demanded; and it is by thus attending to the nature of this demand of our religious being that we are to learn how to worship. This demand, when properly understood, will also indicate the nature of our spiritual being, and its relation to the Divine of the Universe.

The first thing indicated by this desire for worship so universally manifested, is a sense of need, a consciousness of lacking something, which is to be attained by the worshiper through the exercise of his devotional feelings and ceremonies. This sense of need brings with it a consciousness of weakness and imperfection, a feeling of dependence upon some superior wisdom and power, and a desire to enjoy the love and favor of that superior Being.

This feeling prompts the worshiper to search after the object of his veneration, and to form an ideal of his character, person and location, and thus to idealize the object of his worship. But in translating his feelings into thought, idea and imagination, he can not transcend the scope of his mental development. It is for this cause that there exists so great a variety in the modes of worship.

But whatever may be the form of worship, the impulse which prompts the same has its origin in the sense of destitution and need which all feel when they come under the influence of their religious natures. This impulse in its first inception, is not to be confounded with that motive which grows out of the false ideas and images which the ignorant worshiper has respecting God, his character and requirements; but it is that innate feeling welling up from the immortal soul, which first awakened the thought and induced the formation of ideas respecting the object of its veneration.

Let us be careful and not mistake this point. This innate consciousness of weakness and imperfection, this reatizing sense of need and self-destitution, first suggested the idea of an object of worship, and prompted the desire for worship. The undeveloped mind, according to its highest capacity, fashioned that idea and carved its mental image, and then attempted to express its worship according to its highest conception of the nature, character and requirements of its ideal God. The mind having thus ideal-

ized the object of its worship, and invested it with the character and attributes of its highest conception, set about ascertaining what were the probable requirements of that being in respect to his worshipers; and having satisfactorily determined those things, it then conducted its worship under the influence of motives which vary in their nature according to their various ideas of the character and requirements of the God of their worship.

Hence, in studying the nature and ascertaining the teachings of the various modes of worship, we must be careful not to identify the feeling which prompts the desire, and the motive which induces the form of worship. The feeling which prompts the desire is the natural demand of the soul for communion; while the motive which governs the form of expression has its origin in the false ideal of the worshiper.

The unenlightened savage, who worships the Great Spirit in the war dance, amid the din and confusion of his discordant music; or the misguided Hindoo, who throws himself beneath the car of Juggernaut, or stretches himself upon a bed of spikes; or the Mohammedan who bows toward Mecca, and makes his pilgrimage thither; or the Catholic, who says mass and kisses the cross; or the Protestant Christian, who sings and prays to Christ and God—all give expression to the same innate impulse for worship; all are prompted by the same desire to communicate and commune with the Supreme Ruler of the universe. They all differ in their form of expressing that desire, and may be actuated by different motives, according to their ideas of the character and requirements of the object of their veneration, and the influence which their worship is to have upon him and themselves. But while they thus differ, there is a sameness in the character of the primary impulse which prompts the desire for worship; and there is also a sameness in the general characteristics of their ideas of what constitutes worship. Prayer and praise, and the observance of religious ordinances, and the performance of religious ceremonies, constitute the worship of all the various devotees of religion.

This general sameness in respect to what constitutes worship, proclaims an important truth which must not be overlooked in this investigation. It is neither accidental nor educational. It

has as certain and true a foundation in the religious nature as hunger and thirst have in the physical nature. It proclaims as unerringly a demand for that which the religious nature needs for its true development.

Adoration and praise of the Divine Being are the elements of all worship; ordinances and ceremonies are but means of expressing them, or impressing the mind with those things which call them forth. Adoration signifies praying to; and prayer is the condition of the weak and dependent being, conscious of his needs, and desirous of having them supplied. This condition of prayer is most beautifully expressed by the poet:

"Prayer is the soul's sincere desire,
Uttered or unexpressed;
The motion of a hidden fire
That trembles in the breast.
Prayer is the heaving of a sigh,
The falling of a tear;
The upward glancing of an eye,
When none but God is near."

This condition and exercise of the mind known as prayer, implies a sense of need and a desire that the lack may be supplied. It implies dependence upon the being to whom it is addressed, and faith in the power of that being to supply its wants. It matters not what may be the form of religion in which the suppliant believes; the impulse which prompts the desire for prayer, which leads him to desire communion with the object of his adoration, arises out of the demand of his inmost being for that which will supply its constitutional needs.

This innate feeling of dependence and need may be translated very differently by different worshipers, and thus may lead them to adopt very different methods of giving expression to that feeling; for although the feeling is innate in the soul, the form of expression is purely educational. The form of expression will be nearly allied to the idea which the worshiper has of the character and requirements of the object of his adorations, and the manner in which his prayers are to become available to himself.

But whatever may be the form of expression or the expectation of the suppliant, his impulse to pray to the divine Being is

innate, and is expressive of a positive demand of his being which must be supplied, and which, when properly supplied, will lead him along the path of his true destiny.

This will lead me to examine into the true nature and philosophy of prayer, for the purpose of ascertaining *how* it becomes available to the suppliant, and how it is that the prayer of faith can save the sick, and also for the purpose of ascertaining what agency the suppliant has in bringing about the answer to his prayers. It is highly important that the true philosophy of prayer should be understood, in order that we may know how to pray—that is, how to direct the energy of that divine impulse within which prompts to prayer. Without this knowledge we may wrestle and pray fervently; we may exercise strong faith, and yet fail of realizing an answer to our supplications.

The common idea that prayer is in any way to affect or change the condition of the divine mind or will respecting us, and thereby to change his action toward us, is false and delusive; and if an individual entertaining such ideas shall obtain answers to his prayers, they will follow from an accidental compliance with the true philosophy of prayer, and not from any truthfulness there is in his ideal.

The divine Being is Omniscient in his knowledge and wisdom, and needs not to be informed of our desires and necessities through our prayers, nor does he need to be moved by our supplications; for he knows what things we have need of before we ask him, and he is more ready to bestow his blessing upon us, than are earthly parents to give good gifts to their children. God is ever cognizant of our wants, ever present and ever ready to relieve them; therefore so far as our prayers are to affect the divine Being, they are of no avail; yet so far as our prayers are to be answered, those answers must come directly or indirectly from the Divine.

The suppliant, when he prays for himself, is the recipient of the blessing by coming into a condition receptive of it. When he truly prays he enters into the closet of his inmost soul, shuts the door of his heart against all external influences. Appetite, passion, lust, pride, envy, malice, ill will and all uncharitableness, cease. Then arises within him that divine element, love—

holy, pure, truthful, confiding—and it goes forth undisturbed, and unites with the divinity of the universe, coming into conscious communion with God; and the union being thus established, the heat of divine love flows in and invigorates the soul, and the light of divine wisdom illuminates their entire being. The suppliant thus coming into union with the Divine, becomes as it were a portion of God, and is thus made an instrument of divine energy and power. It was this union between Christ and God that made him such an instrument of divine power. He made this union constant. He lived in God and God in him. The wisdom, love and power of God shone through him. He came into this union through prayer; he maintained it by the same means.

The great condition of prayer, then, is to bring the suppliant into conscious union with God, that he may become receptive of divine wisdom, love and power, and thus become unfolded in the divine of his own being; and by thus becoming receptive in himself, he becomes the instrument of divine energy. He is, as it were, the hand of God to work; he is as the wisdom of God to illuminate; he is as the love of God to redeem.

Contemplate Jesus Christ in this relation to God, and then read his sayings of himself, and you will discover a beauty, a truthfulness and a power in his language the world has hitherto failed to discover. You will thus perceive the truth as he perceived and taught it; you will thus understand his perfect oneness with God, and yet his entire dependence upon him; and you will realize the force of that communion, that no man can do the works which he doeth except God be with him.

Such, then, is the true nature of prayer so far as the suppliant is concerned. And it is the highest duty of the individual to come into this union with God, and this union can only be attained by prayer; and hence it is that the impulse to worship is innate and universal in man. It is the aspiration of the inmost soul, seeking its highest destiny by the only means through which it can be attained—prayer.

Do you feel the need of strength, physically and spiritually? Pray until you are in true communion with God, and a divine

energy will permeate your being. Do you feel the need of wisdom?—pray, and when the true union is established, divine wisdom will shine in upon you, and chase all darkness and doubt from your being. Do you feel the need of love to impel you in the discharge of your duties?—pray, and when you have succeeded in entering into the closet of your soul, and have shut out the influences of your external being, so that your inmost can go forth, then will your heart be touched with a living coal from off the altar of God, and a fountain of love will open up within you, and it will become “a well of living water, springing up into everlasting life.”

Prayer also has to do with our social or relational life, out of which arises the desire for social worship. Man is not only a personal being, but also a social one; he is not only subject to a condition of being, but also to one of relation. Prayer, therefore, has to do not only with our being, but also with our relations to other beings. We are not only to pray for ourselves, but also for others; and when we truly do so, we shall not only be blessed ourselves, but others will share the blessing. We shall, by so doing, become the means of divine manifestation to others.

Man has an instinctive perception of the propriety and utility of praying for others. Although he can not perceive how the prayer offered up in the retirement of his closet devotion for those who are near and dear to him is to secure the blessing to them, yet he feels that it may do it, and at times he feels that it will do it. He feels that there is a means, although he understands it not, by which his prayer can be made effectual. Hence it is that the mother, watching by the side of her babe in the silence of midnight, breathes forth a prayer for its health and protection. The wife prays for her absent husband, and the husband for the wife; brother prays for sister, and sister for brother, and friend prays for friend; and the more tender care and solicitude we feel for other hearts, the more surely and fervently do we pray for them. To use the language of the soul, we bring them before God, and ask him to provide for and defend them; and when in sincerity and truth we have done so,

we feel a sort of consciousness of having done a duty which will not be altogether unavailing. There is use in praying for others, and man feels it although he understands it not.

As before remarked, by prayer we come into conscious and real union with God, and divine power, wisdom and love flow into our being by influx. We thus in ourselves become receptive of what is to us a supernatural energy; in other words, we ourselves become a means of divine manifestation to the being who is the subject of our supplications. We become the means in this way: By intense mental action we awaken a mental influence, which can impress minds removed far from us. That this is so has been demonstrated thousands of times. In our spirits we are united with our friends throughout the world, and we have power to impress them with our thoughts and feelings when they are in an impressible condition. Being thus united with them, when by prayer we become united with God, so as to become the recipients of his power, we become the means of transmitting that influence to our friends, and thus we become the messengers of the Divine to them. It is as though a child should go to his parent and ask a gift to bestow upon his brother, and should receive and transmit it to him.

And this is not the only way in which our prayers for others are answered. When in the fervency of our souls we pray for others, and in the spirit of kindness and love we forget every other feeling—when all the lower impulses of our natures are hushed, and lower affinities have ceased—then we attract high and holy Spirits around us, who become instruments of divine power and messengers of divine mercy; they not unfrequently become the means of answering our prayers which are offered up for others.

Thus prayer is a means of coming into union with God, whereby we derive power, wisdom and love from their eternal fountain, and are thus unfolded and perfected in our highest natures, and made instruments of divine manifestation to others.

That prayer which brings us into conscious union with God is the spontaneous going forth of the inmost soul, and can only be enjoyed when all disturbing influence from without is excluded;

hence the invaluable direction of Christ, "When ye pray, enter into your closet and shut the door." While we feel the influence of passion, appetite, lust, pride, hatred, ill-will or any degree of uncharitableness—while our minds are disturbed with thoughts, external feelings and passional affections—the soul can not come into conscious union with God, and consequently can not offer up the effectual and fervent prayer of the righteous man.

Hence it is important that every influence which calls the external being into action should be carefully excluded when we seek to come into conscious union with the Divine. For this reason Christ retired into the mountains and deserts, or as they are sometimes called, "secret places," or "places apart," to pray. When he sought to come into the most intimate union with God, he even excluded his beloved disciples, that their presence might not disturb the sacred stillness of his closet hours.

Verbal praying is useful only in cases when the expression flows from inmost feeling without the intervention of thought; but when the suppliant is obliged to make an intellectual effort to translate his desires and aspirations into oral language—when thought and memory are called into active exercise to furnish the subject of prayer and the language to express it—then its true effect is in a great measure lost.

The influence which one mind exerts over another by its presence is sufficient to embarrass and hinder that going forth of the inmost soul, which is necessary to establish a conscious union with the Divine. If, however, all minds present harmonize and unite in the breathing forth of the soul's holiest aspirations, then they aid each other in their mutual prayers. But such aid must be rendered silently, lest the flow of holy feeling should be disturbed by awakening intellectual exercise.

Persons engaged in these highest devotional exercises have felt the necessity of silence. The least noise awakening self-consciousness in the worshiper for the time being, calls back the soul into itself, and breaks in upon the stream of divine communion. Hence it is that the voice leading in prayer often disturbs the devotion of those who desire themselves to pray. Especially is

this the case when the leader is praying from thought and not from feeling—when there is apparent effort to collect ideas and clothe them in language.

True prayer can not be coerced. If it be not the spontaneous going forth of the soul, if it be not the expression of irrepressible desire and inherent aspiration, it is not such prayer as will gain the audience-chamber of Heaven. Such formal prayers as are offered at stated times to fulfill a duty or complete a form, which are verbose, lengthy, and got up with artistic skill, more nearly resemble the senseless mummeries of the self-righteous Pharisee, than the effectual, fervent prayer of the righteous man.

No person should attempt praying unless he feels the need of prayer, until he feels the demand for communion strong, urgent, irresistible; then let him yield to the heavenly impulse; let his soul come forth and drink of the waters of life, and feed upon the manna of heaven.

I come now to consider another essential feature of worship, which is praise. Praise, like prayer, by the ignorant devotee is supposed to affect the condition of the divine Mind toward the worshiper. They suppose that the divine Being is peculiarly gratified with such marked attention and expressions of respect. In their false ideal they attribute to God the same kind of vanity and love of adulation which characterizes man, and they praise him because by so doing they expect to win his favor. Perceiving not the true wisdom and love of the Divine, they are not under the true impulse to praise him. True praise can only arise as an expression of that wonder, love and admiration which spontaneously gushes forth as the soul perceives the true character of God. The selfish man cannot truly praise God, because he can not perceive that unselfish or divine love which is of God; if he could he would cease to be selfish. The impure in heart can not praise God, because he perceives not the divine sanctity of heavenly purity; if he did, he would cease to be impure. The unjust man can not praise God, because he has no just perception of the omnipotent claims of justice, else he would cease to be unjust. No being can truly praise God any further than he can perceive the true being and character of God.

That which is usually considered praise of God is not true

praise; that is, it is not praise of the only living and true God, but only praise of the God of their false imaginations. They have in themselves a strange ideal of God, and they have ascribed to him a strange character; and their praise is directed to that false ideal of being and character; nevertheless their impulse to praise the Divine of the universe is innate, and is a native demand of the inmost soul.

The spirit of praise proceeds from a perception of the perfections of the divine Being, and its expression is the setting forth of those perfections that others may perceive them, and be won over to the Divine by their matchless beauty and purity.

True praise, then, has reference to the setting forth of the divine perfections, that others may see and adore the Divine Father, and thus be brought into a condition of unity and harmony with God. Its true spirit arises from the condition within ourselves, and its manifestation has reference to beings out of ourselves. Were man excluded from all companionship with his fellows, he might feel the true spirit of praise, but he would feel no demand for an external manifestation of that spirit. He would hold his communion with God, and feel the fountains of love, admiration and joy welling up within his soul; but he would drink them in with the profoundest silence; but when he comes into relation with his fellows—those who have capacity to receive—he must impart those joys.

Praise, then, as a part of worship, belongs to the social and external character of man, and is a translating of the divine into the external and relational of being. Its mission is to harmonize the external mind with the demands and destiny of the internal. Its songs are epithalamium in their character, for they are designed to wed the external and relational in man with the internal and divine. They are the voicings forth of the divine *essere*, to attract man to the divine *esse*.

Hence it is that man has within him an impulse to praise God, and that impulse cannot be satisfied without that which shall be to it a manifestation of the divine character as a subject of praise.

From the foregoing, our conclusion is that worship consists of prayer and praise. Prayer is the exercise of the individual de-

signed to bring him into conscious union with God, that he may unfold his being in harmony with the perfection of the divine character, and thus be made receptive of divine love, wisdom and power from their infinite and eternal fountain. And praise is the true expression or manifestation of that love, wisdom and power in all our relations in life. It is the setting forth of the perfections of the Divine character in the external world, that those in the external may measurably perceive and adore the eternal Father; or as Christ expressed it, it is letting the light so shine before men, that others seeing our good works shall honor and glorify God.

This exercise of praise also reacts upon ourselves. Like the performance of every other duty, it blesses the individual, while its exercise looks to the blessing of others. The individual engaged in truly setting forth the perfections of the divine character that others may perceive them, naturally comes into those perfections in his own character, and thus in his external being comes into divine harmony, and thus becomes sanctified in his entire being, and dwells in God and God in him.

Such, then, being the nature of true worship demanded by the soul, the next question for consideration is, can any outward form be adopted which will aid the individual in coming into the true condition of worship without leading into error? And if an outward form can be adopted which will aid one class of minds, will it be adapted to all classes of minds? These questions must be answered by a careful examination into the nature and constitution of mind in its various stages of development.

Nothing can be more obvious than that mind, in every stage of development, demands some form of worship. The history of the human family demonstrates the existence of such demand. The different nations of the earth, presenting almost every phase of mental development, have attempted to supply that demand by the various forms of worship which they have adopted, and their various forms are expressive of their development. This fact has already been referred to as an indication of the religious nature being innate in man.

Such being the case, that system of philosophy which makes no provision for the development and cultivation of this nature

will fail of the acceptance of man, because it will fail of supplying him with what his inmost nature requires; also that system of philosophy which adopts any form of worship as applicable to all classes of minds, will tend to lead into constant error; and while it will be the means of blessing some, it will be equally instrumental in cursing others.

In the progressive development of mind, it has its capacity to receive, and truth has its volume to fill it; and the one must be suited to the other, or error and antagonism will be the result. There is a sphere of truth suited to every degree of mental development; and when the mind attempts to receive a truth lying beyond the sphere of its development, it will be liable to convert that truth to a falsehood; and so far as it has thoughts and ideas respecting it, they will tend to beget falsehoods. It is upon this principle that there is so much of false worship in the world; and it is for the same reason that so much of evil and falsehood flow from such worship.

The mind, undeveloped in its intellectual and celestial nature, can appreciate no form of worship which is not addressed to the physical perceptions. The form of worship which challenges its respect, must address the eye and the ear. There must be great display of ceremony, of outward pomp and show. The inventors of the Catholic ritual had knowledge of this, and established their form of worship in view of swaying and controlling the mass of undeveloped mind. Hence, in all the parts of their external worship, they have infused a large amount of pomp and parade, calculated to inspire the ignorant devotee with reverence and awe.

These outward forms may be so selected as to suggest higher truths to minds developed to their sphere; and hence the cultivated mind, looking beyond the mere form and ceremony, may take pleasure in them, not for what they are, but for what they suggest. This is the case with the Catholic ritual. Minds highly cultivated, intellectually speaking, engage very zealously in their ceremonial worship, and often feel themselves much benefited thereby; but still such minds look not to the interior or true nature of worship. It is to them a duty and not a pleasure, except in anticipation of the reward which is expected to follow.

The mind developed in its intellectual nature will require less of form and ceremony, and more of intellectual and rational truth. It will be inclined to deify reason and worship at her shrine. Being undeveloped in their inmost or celestial natures, they will not be able to appreciate inmost realities; they will look upon them as mere chimeras of the brain, offsprings of the imagination, having no foundation in reality. Living mostly in their thoughts and ideas, they can perceive nothing which can not be translated therein.

The intellectual worshiper, like the formal and physical, must translate the Divine of the universe into his thoughts and ideas; and although his ideal god is vastly more perfect and beautiful than the god of the physical mind, yet in his intellectual conception he is limited and localized. He makes him a god of strength wisdom and beauty; but nevertheless a reasoning god. In the plenitude of his wisdom he plans, and in the plenitude of his power he executes.

The intellectual worshiper traces the God of his adorations in the divine *existere*, but reaches him not in the divine *esse*. To the intellectual worshiper God is distant, cold, august. He is the great Positive of the universe, acting as it were by mechanical law. The worship suited to this class of mind must deal much with doctrine relating to physical and metaphysical philosophy; it must deduce truths from phenomena, and awaken feeling by the exercise of thought.

The intellectual worshiper, in his highest perception of the love principle which is necessary to fit him for divine communion, supposes that love to man, good will or charity to the neighbor, is the perfection of character; consequently he looks for no higher gratification of his spiritual nature than what flows from a consciousness of having done well, in fulfilling the demands of charity.

This class of mind is inclined to be proud, vain and conceited. It looks upon religion, in its highest aim and end, as designed to make men moral, human and upright in their various relations in life. That end being tolerably secured, they look for nothing farther as its fruits in this life. If they feel the impulse to

worship at all, it is cold, stiff and formal. Those who do not feel the impulse, look upon all exercises of that character as manifestations of weakness and folly.

Those who are developed in the celestiality of their being feel more imperatively the demand for true worship. There is an almost constant going forth of this inward desire and aspiration after the Divine of the universe. They see in the formal worship of the world a gross perversion of that impulse of the soul. They perceive the false ideals which give rise to false motives and false hopes on the part of these outside worshipers; they can not therefore unite with them without lending aid and influence to these false ideals and hopes; and this they can not consistently do.

Being in the inmost of their being, they feel no necessity for any particular form of worship. Perceiving God by an inward consciousness, loving God by an innate affinity, they need no exterior influence, no outward motive to induce in them the exercise of true worship. Prayer and praise go up as a divine exhalation from their souls without preceding thought, without preceding effort. They feel no necessity of visiting Jerusalem or Mount Gerizim to worship and adore the divine Father; for he is present at all times and in all places, ready to impart his wisdom, love and power as they are ready to receive.

They need no external form, they need no sacred canon or rubric, because in their worship they are in the divine *esse* which is without form, and they perceive the divine *esse* by the influx of that *esse* into their conscious being. Their worship consists in the outgoing of their inmost souls to unite and commune with God, and is rewarded by the inflowing of the divine spirit, infusing life, light and joy. Thus they realize that God is a Spirit, and they know what it is to worship him in spirit and in truth.

These inmost worshipers perform no religious service from a sense of duty or obligation; they worship not in view of any reward which is to follow therefrom; they are not in bondage to their hopes or their fears. Their worship is the spontaneous breathing forth of their inmost being; they perform all from an inward love and delight. Being united with God in their com-

scious *esse*, they harmonize with the divine *existence*, and thus they are clothed with the wedding garment, and can sit down at the Marriage Supper of the Lamb.

This figure of the marriage supper, which is the conjugal union of the external with the internal, the natural with the Divine, and which will take place when all things in the individual are brought into subjection to the Divine, is most beautiful and appropriate; but I can not dwell upon it here.

Thus it will be perceived that different forms of worship are demanded by different classes of minds. Those in the external physical demand a form which addresses their hopes and fears. They are in the love of self, and their impulse to worship must be translated by the selfish standard; any higher form would not be appreciated and enjoyed by them.

Those in the external spiritual must have a form which is addressed to their intellectual faculties. Reason must be deified; that is, the divine *existere* must be magnified and worshiped. There must be order and beauty and taste in everything appertaining thereto. They must have beautiful temples, adorned with everything calculated to excite a sense of the chaste, the beautiful and the refined.

The internal spiritual, or inmost worshipers need no temples made with hands, other than such as will shelter them from the inclemencies of the weather, furnish them with places to sit and commune with one another, and unitedly to commune with God. They need no form, no ceremony to typify or illustrate the divine being and manifestation toward man, for they have that perception within themselves; they need no external arrangement to call forth feelings of love, adoration and praise, for they go forth spontaneously. Christ was an inmost worshiper. By the standard of his life and character let inmost worshipers be tried, by his precepts and examples let them live, and they will realize his saying, "that if a man love me and keep my commandments, my Father will love him, and we will come and make our abode with him."

FALSITY OF BIBLE MORALITY, ACCORDING TO ORTHODOXY.

"We know that God spake unto Moses ; but as for this fellow, we know not whence he is."—John, 9 : 20.

MEN have ever been prone to believe that God belonged to the past, and that his word and will were to be found only in the records and sayings of antiquity ; and they consume their time in searching after the hidden meaning of ancient forms and ceremonies, and studying the supposed opinions and sentiments of the ancient fathers ; thinking thereby to arrive at truth as uttered by God himself ; affirming that God has spoken, and that it remains for us to find out what he said and meant.

By some sort of logic they have arrived at the conclusion that God has had his say out, and that it is wicked and infidel to expect any farther communication ; that for some wise purpose God has committed the salvation of the future to their undoubting faith in the past, in the wisdom of those who are known to have been ignorant, in the integrity of those known to be false, and in the purity of those known to have been corrupt.

By what sort of intellectual and moral logic they infer that such characters as Moses, David and Solomon held direct communication with Deity, it is hard to understand. There certainly was nothing in their characters or conduct which could commend them to the favorable consideration of any just, moral and upright mind ; and if truth, purity and justice are to be understood by any standard the man of Nazareth set up, they were very far from being models for imitation. A more cruel and bloodthirsty lawgiver never lived than Moses ; a more licentious and bloody king never reigned than David. The whole history of the Jewish nation,

in the administration of whose affairs Jehovah is said to have largely participated, is as barren of any correct principle of morals or religion, as is the history of any Pagan nation under heaven.

Take as a specimen of divine morality the affair of David with Bathsheba, the wife of Uriah. David, celebrated for his licentiousness, is smitten with the beauty of the fair Hittite. His lustful passions are enkindled; his many wives and concubines were not enough to satisfy his amorous propensities, so he must appropriate Bathsheba to his lusts. He does so while her husband is absent fighting the battles of the king. But there is danger of exposure, and no way to avoid it but to cause Uriah to be slain. He does so, and now all is safe with the man after God's own heart. There was a prophet of God, one who held communication direct with Jehovah, and what he uttered was God speaking through him; so that Nathan was but the instrument, God the speaker; therefore when we listen to the language of Nathan, we must understand we are listening to the voice of God; and when we are receiving the philosophy of that discourse, we must understand we are receiving the philosophy of God; and if there is any defect in the apparent morality of the lecture, we must not censure, for it is the morality of God.

What was David's crime with Bathsheba and her husband? There can be but one answer: *lust—wicked, burning lust*. It was the shameless lust of his soul, fired into madness by the beauty of the fair Hittite. He had no malice against Uriah; he was his faithful captain; he would gladly have saved him, could he have done so and have continued his lustful intercourse with Bathsheba without discovery. That being impossible, Uriah must be slain by the sword of Ammon, and Bathsheba becomes the wife of David. This thing displeased the Lord, and so he sent the prophet Nathan to David to reproach him for his sin, and threaten him with punishment. After Nathan had presented the subject under the parable of the rich man who had many flocks and herds, sparing them, and taking the poor man's little ewe lamb and killing it for the wayfaring man that came unto him, and thus arousing the anger of David against the offender, and procuring sentence of death against him, Nathan

told David that he was that man. He then proceeded to denounce the judgment of the Lord against him. "Now, therefore, the sword shall never depart from thy house, because thou hast despised me, and hast taken the wife of Uriah the Hittite to be thy wife. Thus saith the Lord: Behold, I will raise up evil against thee out of thine own house, and I will take thy wives before thine eyes and give them unto thy neighbor, and he shall lie with thy wives in the sight of this sun, for thou didst it secretly, but I will do this thing before all Israel and before the sun."

Such was the sin of David, and such the threatened punishment of Jehovah. Now mark the sequel: "And David said unto Nathan, I have sinned against the Lord." That is all. "And Nathan said unto David, The Lord hath also put away thy sin; thou shalt not die. Howbeit because by this deed thou hast given great occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme, the child that is born unto thee shall die."

Let us analyze this transaction to find the moral contained in the lesson. David, stimulated by his lusts, had treacherously caused his friend to be slain, and had possessed himself of his wife. The possession of Bathsheba was the end he sought. The raging of his lusts stimulated him to commit the deed. Did Jehovah complain of his wicked lust? Most certainly not; for Nathan represents the Lord as saying, "I gave thee thy master's (Saul's) house, and thy master's wives into thy bosom." And furthermore, he did not require him to put away the objects of his lusts. He allowed him to claim Bathsheba for his wife, and to continue his lustful intercourse with her. But it is said that David repented. Of what did he repent? of his lust? of the murder he had committed? of the treachery he had been guilty of? By no means. When threatened with punishment, he acknowledged that he had sinned against the Lord; but he yielded up nothing that he obtained, but lived on in the enjoyment of the fruit of his crimes; and Jehovah, so far from complaining, committed the building of his house to the fruit of his lustful intercourse. Are we to look to that transaction as being expressive of Jehovah's idea of justice and purity? Is such a kind of penitence sufficient to wash away such guilt? If one in this community should conspire to kill his friend, that he might possess him-

self of his wife, would such evidence of penitence be sufficient to restore him to the confidence and respect of the community? If he would have us believe that his sorrow was genuine, would he not find it necessary to put away the object of his criminal lusts, and do works meet for repentance?

But lust was unobjectionable to the Jewish Jehovah. He was not blind to the condition of David's mind; he knew his thoughts and feelings. Dare any one deny the lustful condition of David's heart? what demand could the pure in heart have for so many wives and concubines? And yet Jehovah associated with him, inspired him, and filled him with his Spirit, and yet never made David sensible of the wrongfulness of his lusts.

Such is a fair specimen of the moral and religious sentiment of those with whom God associated and conversed in former times, according to modern notions; such are they of the Jews who have been handed down to us as men after God's own heart; to whom the oracles of God have been committed, and from whom we are bound to receive them, upon the penalty of eternal damnation.

By what principle of affinity the Divine Being could select such men to become the representatives of his character and the exponents of his will, is not easily perceived; and if he could hold direct and personal intercourse with them, unless there has been much progress in the character of the Divine Being since that time, we can not see why he can not hold as direct and personal intercourse with better men in more modern times. We are told that the Divine Being has ceased to communicate with man; that having said all he wished to say, he has closed the volume of inspiration, and that therefore we are to look for nothing more. But upon what authority is that assertion made? Where is the evidence to be found that such is the case? Why have we not as much reason to expect communications to-day, as the Jews had in the time of Christ?

They knew that God had spoken unto Moses; they believed he had spoken through the prophets; but they did not believe he had anything to say through Jesus of Nazareth; and they had as much reason for their belief as the Pharisees of to-day have for theirs.

Upon what principle is it demanded that none but the pure in heart and life shall hold communion with God in modern times, while the licentious, corrupt and profane held such communion in ancient times? Why is it demanded that modern spiritual communications shall disclose new moral and scientific truths to the world, even when professing to come from finite and imperfect Spirits, when in ancient times the communications professing to come from God himself were false to morality and science?

By what rule of criticism do the believers in the plenary inspiration of the Old Testament condemn modern spiritual communications for their low standard of morality and religion, of science and literature? Very low indeed must be the origin and character of that modern communication which does not condemn war, slavery and lust. I affirm, without fear of contradiction, that the intelligence and morality of modern spiritual communications, low as many of them are, are above the standard of the Old Testament morality, even where God himself is made to speak. Then, again, I inquire by what standard of criticism do those objectors determine the genuineness of Jewish Spiritualism and the fallacy of modern communications upon the question of scientific and moral merit?

Much has been said by the opponents of Spiritualism about the tendency of the new philosophy to licentiousness, and great effort has been made to make it responsible for the old patriarchal doctrine of free love. The charge is without foundation; but if it were really true, I know not with what consistency the believers in the divine origin of the Old Testament, and the inspirations of Moses, David or Solomon, could object to such a result. That love must be free indeed which could exceed in lust and debauchery the Old Testament worthies.

What, then, is the standard by which the religious world determines the genuineness of the communications in olden time, and the fallacy of those of to-day? It can not be from any superiority in science, in literature, in art, in morals or religion; it can not be upon the ground of a mere rational philosophy, or of a purer influence. If they knew that God spake unto Moses, but has now ceased speaking unto man, the grave question still returns: How do they know it? It can not be because God

has communicated all the truth that it is needful and proper for man to know, or that can be communicated to man; it can not be because that which is communicated is so plain upon all points that all can understand alike the communication. The ten thousand earnest and honest differences of those which receive the same authority and read from the same book, demonstrates that there is some obscurity and difficulty in understanding and harmonizing those writings.

But, again, if man has ever been the subject of direct spiritual communications with God or angels, it demonstrates that he possesses such a faculty. Unless man possess a nature capable of being thus consciously addressed by Spirit, all pretensions of such communications in any age of the world must be false; and he who denies the possibility of such communications to-day, denies that they ever were possible, unless he can show clearly some change in the constitution of man or Spirits creating such impossibility.

If God or angels ever spake with man, as one being speaks with another, that fact would demonstrate three things: first, that Spirits had the power to speak; second, that man had the power to perceive their speaking; and, third, that there is a media connecting Spirits and men through which, and by means of which such communication could be made.

When it is demonstrated that Spirits have, at any age of the world, been seen of men, then is it demonstrated that Spirits as such have a form capable of being made visible, and that man possesses perceptive powers capable of being so unfolded as to perceive such form.

When it is demonstrated that Spirits have, at any age of the world, exerted physical force, such as moving material bodies, rolling stone, opening doors, gates, breaking chains, or anything of that kind, then is it demonstrated that such power appertains to them as spiritual beings, and that under favorable circumstances they can exercise it in such a way as to manifest it to man. When it is demonstrated that angels or spiritual beings have so connected themselves with those in the body, as to control their thoughts, feelings and volitions, so as to cause them to speak in languages unknown to themselves, then is it demonstrated that the nature

of angels or Spirits, and men, is such that such union can be affected, and that men may be under spiritual influence and control.

And thus we might continue to particularize every phenomenon of Spirit-life and action, which is said to have taken place in the past. Whatever has been, is demonstrated to be possible both in its being, action and manifestation ; and whoever affirms the contrary takes upon himself the burden of proof to demonstrate that some change has taken place by reason of which the possible has become impossible.

But, again, the objectors to modern spiritual manifestations affirm the unerring certainty of ancient manifestations. It is wicked in the extreme to doubt the capacity or integrity of those who were the subjects of spiritual perception and influence in the days of Abraham and Lot, of Moses and Samuel, of David and Solomon, of Peter and John ; and it is equally as wicked to have faith in the capacity and integrity of men and women of to-day.

But if there was unerring certainty in the spiritual manifestations of ancient times, it must have been because man possessed the faculty of determining the reality of such manifestations beyond the possibility of error ; for if there was any possibility that those manifestations and communications were the result of the secret and hidden forces of nature, or the automatic action of the back brain, according to Rogers and his pupil Mahan, why, then, we can not affirm with certainty that spiritual phenomena and communication ever did take place. We can not rely with undoubting certainty upon the fact of spiritual intercourse and phenomena, unless man possesses the faculty of distinguishing with infallible certainty, the genuineness of such intercourse and phenomena from all that is false and spurious. Whoever, then, affirms the unerring certainty, of the intercourse and phenomena of Spirits in ancient times, affirms in man the faculty of infallibly determining the genuineness of such phenomena.

And, again, if there be any such thing as spiritual intercourse and spiritual phenomena, and if man's well-being in any manner depends upon his ability to distinguish between the genuine and the spurious, what are we to think of the wisdom and goodness of that father who holds us responsible for distinguishing the true from the false, and yet has furnished us with no means of doing

so—requires us to believe in the genuine and reject the spurious, upon penalty of eternal damnation, and yet has given us no certain means of determining which are to be believed and which to be rejected? Unless these objectors can give some certain tests, some characteristic sign, by which the true can be known, so that all error can be avoided, they should denounce all manifestations as spurious, or cease their objections. Then let them give us the tests, point out the signs, and we will compare notes and see wherein modern Spiritualism falls short of ancient in science, in literature, in philosophy, morality or religion. We will be happy to compare notes with them, and ascertain which harmonizes best with truth, purity and love—which is best adapted to the nature and needs of man—which is best calculated to elevate and expand the soul, and give it high and exalted views of God and his government—modern spiritual phenomena and philosophy, or ancient? We will be pleased to examine the question, whether the character and teachings of Jesus best accord with the character and teachings of Moses and David, or with the teachings of the modern philosophy; whether the works of causing the blind to see, the deaf to hear, and the lame to walk, under the practice of modern Spiritualism, bears any resemblance in its philosophy and practice to the like works performed under the administration of Jesus and his apostles; and whether the Orthodox objectors furnish any better evidence of possessing the gifts of the Spirit promised the true believer, than do the believers of the new philosophy.

It would be an interesting and pleasing exercise to be subjected to a trial before an intelligent and impartial tribunal upon the question: Which gave the best evidence of faith in, and a practice of, the teachings and works of Jesus—the modern Orthodox or the modern Spiritualist? whose faith is best manifested in their works? Said Jesus, "Whosoever believeth in me, the works that I do shall he do, and greater works shall he do," etc. So says the modern Spiritualist. Said Jesus, "These signs shall follow them that believe," naming certain spiritual gifts. So says the modern Spiritualist. But what says the Orthodox? The day of miracles is past. The believer shall not work the works of Jesus. Faith does not confer the gifts of the Spirit. Paul said that the

gift of tongues was for a sign to the unbeliever, and that the gift was from one and the same Spirit with the other gifts. But Rogers and his pupil, Mahan, say that the speaking with tongues is the result of the automatic play of the back brain, and that Spirit has nothing to do with it. And yet these are the men that arraign modern Spiritualists for teaching infidel doctrines and working the works of the Devil. What in the days of Christ was an evidence of his divinity, in these latter days is denounced as devilish.

But again: The Orthodox objectors to these spiritual phenomena have taught doctrines involving the principles of spiritual communication and spiritual power, and professed to be sincere in their teachings until modern demonstrations threatened to demolish their theological dogmas, and put an end to the despotic rule they had exercised over the minds and bodies of the people.

They taught the existence of angels or spiritual beings as ministering spirits to man—as being charged to watch over and protect him from danger and from harm. But how were spiritual beings to perform the office of messengers and ministers unless they had power to act, and man to receive their action—unless they had power to impress, and man had the susceptibility of receiving the impression? How could a spiritual being admonish man of danger, or stimulate him to duty, unless he had power to affect his consciousness? and of what use to man would be all the guardian angels of the universe when robbed of the power to act upon him, either consciously or unconsciously? The very doctrine of angels and ministering Spirits implies their power and man's susceptibility—affirms the existence and action of every principle involved in spiritual communications. Therefore those who oppose Spiritualism upon the ground that it is impossible and absurd to suppose that spiritual beings can communicate with man, and make physical demonstrations, to be consistent, must dismiss all angels and guardian spirits as being false and absurd vagaries of the mind, having their origin in the automatic action of the back brain. For such objectors there is no middle ground between Spiritualism and Materialism.

But again: These Orthodox objectors have affirmed the doctrine of man's impressibility to spiritual influence in their doctrine of

temptations. It has been the burden of their cry that the Devil went about like a roaring lion seeking whom he might devour; that he was constantly filling our minds with evil thoughts and evil affections. How could the Devil do this if man is not subject to the influx of spiritual influences? The Devil does not speak to the physical ear; he does not address the natural eye. So far as he has power to influence man it must be by inspiration, or by making physical demonstrations, and in either event the principle of spiritual communication is affirmed, and these Orthodox objectors must give up the Devil and his influence, (and that would be giving up the ghost,) if they would be consistent in their objections to the possibility of spiritual communications with man.

But, again, it has been a part of their creed that man was subject to the influence of the holy or good Spirit. They have often affirmed that they perceived and felt its presence. They claim that it has at times dictated their thoughts—controlled their affections. Its presence in the soul has given life, peace and joy. We have often heard them pleading most earnestly for God to send down his Spirit to enlighten their minds, enlarge their understandings, and purify their affections. All this, if it meant anything at all, affirmed the spiritual impressibility of man—that he was the conscious subject of spiritual influence. Let then these objectors admit the spiritual impressibility of man, or deny their faith in the inspiration of God. Strip Christianity of the doctrines of spiritual impressibility and spiritual power, and it becomes a mere moral atheism. It is not one whit better than any other Paganism, having only the *form* of godliness, but denying the power.

But a class of Orthodox objectors admit the spiritual impressibility of man and the power of Spirits to make physical demonstrations, but deny that good and truthful Spirits are permitted to communicate with man. From what class of Spirits do they draw their angels and guardian Spirits? Do they belong to the administration of the Devil? and are they those who are called his "imps?" If they do not, it seems good Spirits are permitted to impress man, and man is subject to their influence.

But upon what principle of philosophy or ethics do these objectors determine that good Spirits are not permitted to hold com-

verse with men? Is not man impressible from both classes of influence? According to their theology the same individual, according to his pleasure, is subject to the influence of the Divine Spirit, or to the influence of the Devil; and he may be inspired with truth or with falsehood, according to the source of his inspirations. Then, if good Spirits do not communicate with men, it is not because man is incapable of receiving good impressions.

But upon what principle of wisdom, goodness and truth is it, that the Devil and all his imps are permitted to approach man and communicate with him, and inspire him with evil and falsehood, and all good Spirits are kept back? For whose benefit has such an arrangement been made? For the benefit of God, man or the Devil? Does God desire to enlighten, purify and redeem his ignorant and wayward children? and has he found that the influence of the Devil and his angels upon man tends more effectually to enlighten and purify him than the influence of good angels, and the Spirits of just men made perfect? Would it be wise and just and good in God to withhold the possible influence of good Spirits, in their work of enlightening man and elevating him from his present low estate, and send in its stead the impure and corrupting influence of ignorant and degraded beings, empowered to entice, deceive and destroy those over whom they could obtain an influence? Such an hypothesis is dishonorable to God. If his design is to cheat and damn the race, then such an arrangement is wisely adapted to the accomplishment of such purposes; but if all his works are to image forth the wisdom, love and power of the divine original, no arrangement of the above kind can be admitted.

But it is affirmed by some that angels, although spiritual beings, can impress men and can make physical demonstrations, but that they are not the Spirits of those who have once inhabited the human form; that while it may be admitted that angels can do these things, the Spirits of departed human beings can not. But how is it ascertained that angels are a distinct race of beings—that they never inhabited the human form? By what principles of induction do they arrive at such conclusion, and where do they get their historic information, and what is the generic or specific difference between the constitution of an angel

and a disembodied human Spirit? So far as we have any information on the subject, they do not appear to be a distinct class of beings. The name, angel, has respect to their office as messengers, and not to their character of beings. Whatever may be the character of the being, if he is acting as messenger or minister he assumes the office, and may be designated by the name angel. Hence, according to use we have the expression, "the angels of God, and also the Devil and his angels, expressing the office in which the being is acting, so that the name indicates nothing respecting the nature or origin of angelic beings; except, perhaps, as usually indicating spiritual beings rather than material individualities, although the name is sometimes applied to them.

Again: So far as we have any information or knowledge on the subject, everything indicates that angels or spiritual messengers and ministers are disembodied human Spirits. They have thoughts and affections like men; they are spiritually receptive and impartive like men; they converse like human beings; they have all the appearance of human beings, in form, feature and expression; they are, in nothing hitherto perceived, to be distinguished from human beings. So far as authority may be consulted to establish facts, the same beings are sometimes called angels, and sometimes men, in the Bible.

Again: There is no known or apparent occasion for angels being other and different beings from the Spirits of men deceased. If human beings have spiritual faculties to be addressed, those possessing the like faculties can address them.

But again, there is manifest propriety in considering the Spirits of human beings, angels, both guardian and ministerial. From their very nature and constitution, they are best adapted to the work of guardianship and ministration, and the work is best adapted to their growth and development.

But lastly, in the order of individualization there can be no generic or specific difference between angels and the Spirits of human beings. Man, in the individualization of his Spirit, joins upon the Divine, and includes within himself the last highest ultimate of finite individuality. Created in the divine image; being the son and child of God, there can be no higher save God

the infinite. No finite being can have higher capacities of wisdom, love and power; for man is the recipient of divine wisdom, love and power into his consciousness; and until there exists a greater being than God, there can be no higher finite individuality. I will dwell upon this branch of the subject in a future Number upon the nature and office of angels.

Thus we see that there is no middle ground between the philosophy and phenomena of modern spiritual manifestations and material atheism. That philosophy which will demonstrate the uncertainty and fallacy of all modern manifestations as being spiritual, will sweep away the last vestiges of evidence that spiritual beings ever communicated with man, or that such beings exist at all. When the doctrine of the automatic action of the back brain, as taught by Rogers and his pupils, shall be established, prepare for the extinguishment of the last ray of spiritual light in the dark night of eternal and universal atheism!

PROPOSITION.

SUFFERING, without the possibility of ultimating a proportionate good in the sufferer, is repugnant to every pure and holy affection, and can gratify none but the selfish and revengeful.

Hence the sufferings of an immortal being, after the possibility of ultimating a proportionate good in the sufferer is past, can not be contemplated without giving pain to every pure and holy being.

Hence, according to the fundamental condition and law of the soul, eternal suffering would destroy the happiness of the universe—would fill the bosoms of the highest angels with sadness and sorrow.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY.

IT is safe to take the following positions as true in respect to the apostles, at the time of Jesus' crucifixion and supposed resurrection. Their fallibility appears,

1st. In their mistaken views of the character and mission of Christ.

2d. In their mistaken views of the nature of the kingdom he came to establish.

3d. In their mistaken views as to who were to be the subjects of that kingdom.

4th. And in their mistaken views of when and how they were to become such subjects.

If any one were disposed to question the correctness of the first position taken, it would be sufficient to refer them to the fact that Jesus would not permit them to preach him as the Messiah, while he directed them to teach that the kingdom of Heaven was at hand. Their views of the character and mission of the expected Messiah were such, that had he authorized them to speak upon that subject, they would have taught nothing but falsehoods. They would have held out false motives, and awakened false expectations which were never to be realized, and consequently, instead of teaching the truth they would have embarrassed it, and have laid the foundation for destroying all faith in their teachings.

Furthermore, Jesus told them that he had many things to say unto them which they could not receive—that is, which they could not understand—and therefore he must defer communicating them; and among the very things which they could not understand was the subject of his character and mission.

They did not expect he was to be slain, notwithstanding he had

so said; and being slain, they did not understand that he was to be raised from the dead. If these things were necessary to enable Jesus to fulfill his mission, they did not know it. They believed up to the time of the arrest of Jesus that he was to be the temporal king of the Jews, and on his last journey from Galilee, they entered Jerusalem in a sort of triumphal procession; and it was during that very journey that the mother of James and John made her request that her two sons might occupy the first position in his government, and this request engendered strife among the disciples, and they were offended at James and his brother for it, for which Jesus reproved them.

After Jesus was crucified their hope of him as the Messiah failed. Said Cleophas and his fellow-traveler, on their way to Emmaus, "We *had* hoped it was he who should have redeemed Israel." They say of themselves that they remained together, and mourned and wept. The women who belonged to their company had prepared their ointments and spices to embalm his body, and were at the tomb for that purpose when they found the body was missing; and when they reported his resurrection to the disciples, "their words seemed to them as idle tales and they believed them not." So great was their surprise that they even disputed their own senses, for it is remarked, that after he had appeared to them in person, "some doubted."

The apostles continued in this expectation and belief for a long time after Jesus had ceased to be seen of them. When he commissioned them to go into all the world and preach his Gospel they were surprised, and inquired if he would not then restore the kingdom to Israel. His answer to their question, although true in itself, did not awaken the true perception in their mind, and consequently did not correct their previous false idea upon that subject. They therefore went forth to preach Jesus as the temporal prince who had conquered the last enemy, Death, and had gone into Heaven to await the time when the Jews should be sufficiently instructed and convinced of his Messiahship through their preaching and testimony to give in their adhesion to him, and that when that work had been accomplished he would return and establish the expected kingdom of Heaven upon earth.

During the first years of the apostles' preaching, they had no

idea of a spiritual king or a spiritual kingdom. They did not understand that the kingdom of Heaven was to be established *in* man, rather than *between* men, and that Christ was to rule *in* him, rather than to rule *over* him.

The idea of a personal reign by means of an external force or power—that men were to be physically coerced into obedience to the laws of Christ's government, or to be destroyed thereby, when he should come to establish *himself* upon the throne of his father David, was the prevailing belief and expectation among the apostolic teachers, and that belief and expectation has been handed down in the Church to the present day.

In the third place, the primitive teachers of Christianity not only misunderstood the character and office of Christ, and also of his government, but they had no true idea as to who were to be his subjects, and how they were to become such. During the time that Jesus remained with them and taught them, and for a long time after, they supposed that none but Jews were to have the benefits of the new government. The proposition that Gentiles were to be considered as objects of divine favor, was a new and startling one to the apostles and believing Jews. They had received the gift of the Spirit; they had spoken with tongues; they had healed the sick, cured the lame, and restored the blind to sight; but they had not learned that a Gentile could become a subject of the new government and receive the benefits thereof. Although the Pentecostal day on which the Spirit had been so wonderfully manifested upon them had been past for years, and that Spirit which was to enlighten them into all truth had been poured out without stint upon them; they had not learned enough of the true character of Christ's mission and government to understand who were to become the true and legitimate subjects thereof, nor how they were to become such.

Peter's vision of the sheet let down from heaven, and the instructions thereupon given, began to awaken in his mind the idea that the Gentiles were not to be altogether neglected; also the fact that the Gentiles received the gift of the Spirit as well as the Jews, confirmed that idea. Some years had elapsed after the Pentecostal season when these things took place, and when a convention was held by the apostles to determine upon this matter,

and it was finally settled that the Gospel was to be preached to the Gentile as well as to the Jew. This decision was not acquiesced in at once by the believing Jews, and it was a subject of doubt and disputation among them for years afterward.

And after the question had been settled that they were to become subjects of Christ's government, the perplexing question still remained, *how* they were to become subjects—whether they must not be circumcised, and become Jews, and thus bring themselves within the covenant; and it took years to settle that question, and it was settled by argument rather than inspiration.

These things demonstrate that the apostles were fallible in their understandings and perceptions of the truth at the time of, and for a long time after, the supposed resurrection of Jesus' body. That they continued fallible for years after the inspiration of the day of Pentecost; and if they ever became infallible, it must have been at a time long after their histories failed to record their sayings and doings.

It would be well for those who believe in the infallibility of the apostles and the apostolic writings, to inquire upon what such faith is based. They will find, on careful examination, that it is not based upon any pretensions or claim of the apostles themselves; it is not based upon the correctness of their primitive perception of the character, teaching or mission of Christ, nor upon the nature and necessity of things in reference to their position as the witnesses and historians of Christ's words and works. They will find nothing in fact or philosophy to justify such an assumption. It is all based upon the false assumption of corrupt priests and religious demagogues.

Having premised thus much, I will proceed to examine the question of the literal resurrection of Christ's body, both in its fact and philosophy.

It has been remarked already that the apostles honestly believed and asserted that his body was raised from the dead; and they affirm that he foretold the event several times during his lifetime, and that the angels at the sepulcher also informed the women that he had arisen, and had gone before them into Galilee, as he had said.

My first proposition upon this point is that Jesus never affirmed

that his body was to be raised from the dead, and that his disciples did not so understand his sayings until after his supposed resurrection. The doctrine of the resurrection of the body was no new doctrine in the days of Jesus. The Pharisees, the most numerous and popular sect among the Jews, taught as an article of their philosophy that the body would be raised up; while the Sadducees disputed it. The Pharisees connected the idea of man's future existence with the fact that his body was to be re-animated; and the Sadducees, denying the resurrection of the body, consequently denied the immortality of the soul, because none of them supposed that man could live without his physical body. Jesus' disciples were Jews, and being either Pharisees or Sadducees in their philosophy, they knew what was understood by the doctrine of the resurrection of the body; and had Jesus told them in plain and simple language that he was to be slain, and after three days was to rise again from the dead, they would have had no difficulty in understanding the natural import of the language, whether they believed it or not; and when he was taken and slain, according to his own prediction, they would naturally have been looking for the fulfillment of the rest of his prediction. Especially have we a right to expect this, inasmuch as, according to their own statement, these predictions were made immediately preceding the occurrence of the event, the last one, perhaps, while he was on his last journey to Jerusalem, and also during his last discourses with his disciples.

If he had told them distinctly that he was to arise from the dead, they could not have failed to understand him, nor could they, understanding him, so soon have forgotten it. That they did not so understand him is evidenced from their own declaration, as well as from their conduct on that occasion. They affirm of themselves that "They did not know the Scripture that he was to rise from the dead;" and when it was so reported, their words seemed to him as idle tales, and they believed not. Nay more, after their own eyes had seen what they supposed to be his living, moving and speaking body, even then some doubted; and it was not until all became fully confirmed in the idea, that they found anything in Scripture or elsewhere to justify any such expectation. Cleophas and his fellow-traveler, on their way to Em-

maus, informed Jesus that they were *astonished* at the report of the women who said they had seen a vision of angels who had told them that he was arisen.

The fact will not be denied that Jesus made use of no language which was properly calculated to awaken in them the idea that he was to be slain and raised again from the dead; nor will it be claimed that they had any such expectation until after these events are said to have taken place.

After they were satisfied that such an event had occurred, then they could call to mind expressions which Jesus had made use of, and which at the time they did not understand, and they could translate such sayings into their new idea; and notwithstanding such idea they have given us what, in their new light, they suppose to be a prediction of his death and resurrection, although they did not so understand it at the time. Thus they gave us their new understanding, but not Jesus' original language.

One of the historians, in speaking of Jesus' predictions of his death and resurrection, makes use of this language: "And he took his disciples, and began to show unto them how that Christ must suffer many things, and be crucified, and on the third day rise again from the dead," etc. Now the historian does not intend to say that Christ explained any of these things to their understandings, so that they perceived his meaning. But no one can doubt that had he intended teaching them any such literal fact, he could have selected language simple and plain enough to have made them understand his meaning. The historian undoubtedly referred to some such an interview as is recorded by John, when Christ told them that he was going away, and would come again and then receive them unto himself; also that a little while they should see him, and again a little while and they should not see him, because he should go unto his Father. Expressions of this kind, which were not understood at the time they were uttered, might very honestly be translated by them into predictions of his death and resurrection, after they had become satisfied that these events had taken place, and I have no doubt that all predictions made by him in reference to his death and re-appearance were of that character.

My second proposition on this point, that the angels did not

tell the women at the tomb that Christ's body had risen from the dead. I do not doubt that the women so understood the import of their language, and they could not well understand them any other way. The simple annunciation which the angels wished to make to the women was, that Jesus was not in the tomb, but that he was yet alive, and might be seen of his disciples in Galilee. One of the historians, speaking of it, uses the language that "he is yet alive." But this language, affirming that he was yet alive, could not be understood by the women or the disciples to mean anything else than that he was risen from the dead; for according to their idea, they could not understand how one who had been dead could be yet alive, unless he had risen from the dead; hence they reported the declaration of the angels according to their understanding of its meaning. One of the meanings of the word translated "he is risen" is, "he is present again," another is, "he is alive," so that we are not authorized to affirm that the angels said his body was raised from the dead.

But the circumstances stated by the historians absolutely forbid us to believe that Jesus appeared to his disciples by means of his physical body. It is worthy of notice that those who saw him after his supposed resurrection did not know him at first, even after they had been informed that he was yet alive. Thus Mary Magdalene who had been with him every day for several months before his crucifixion, and who had even followed his body to the tomb, "and saw how it was laid," did not know him at first, but mistook him for the gardener. She had not been separated from him forty-eight hours, and yet did not recognize him. So with Cleophas and his fellow-traveler; they walked with him for some time and conversed with him, and yet did not know him. This would not have been possible, had he appeared to them in his physical body. When he appeared before the ten, they still doubted their senses while they would gladly believe it was the Lord.

Furthermore, he appeared and disappeared under circumstances which are absolutely inconsistent, nay more, impossible, if we suppose he was in the physical body. When the eyes of Cleophas and his companion were opened so that they saw him, he vanished from their sight. He did not walk away from them, but

he ceased to be seen. When he appeared in the midst of the ten the evening after his supposed resurrection, he did not enter in the natural and only possible way for those possessing a physical form. The historians are careful to notice that the ten were assembled, and the doors were all shut, when suddenly he appeared in their midst, and blessed them, and then as suddenly and mysteriously vanished. So also was it eight days after, when the eleven were assembled, and the doors were all shut.

If Jesus had been clothed with flesh and bones, as they supposed, he could not have appeared and vanished under those circumstances. Another incident mentioned by the historians can be true only on the hypothesis that Jesus appeared in a spiritual body. The angels informed the women that he had gone into Galilee, and a few moments afterward he appeared to Mary before the door of his own tomb. Both these statements might be true if Jesus was in the spiritual body, but both could not be true in respect to the natural body. If he had gone into Galilee, he could not still stand at the door of his tomb in Jerusalem.

When he appeared to Mary at the tomb he would not permit her to touch him. The reason why he would not is very obvious. She would have discovered that it was not his physical body which thus stood before her, and yet she could not have understood how it could have been him unless it were; and by so doing, instead of aiding her faith in his yet being alive, it would have destroyed it.

Is it objected that this can not be true because he invited his disciples to handle him and see, because a "Spirit had not flesh and bones as they saw him have." There is just cause for doubting the literal truth of Luke's statement on the subject. It must be remembered that Luke was not present on any of these occasions, and therefore does not speak from his own knowledge; while those who were present, Matthew and John, affirm no such thing. John gives an account of the same meeting at which Luke says this took place, and tells what was said and done, but he does not sustain Luke's statement; and yet John was as desirous of proving the resurrection of Christ as was Luke; and if it had been as Luke states, he would hardly have omitted to mention it.

John does not state that Christ, on another occasion eight days after the one to which Luke refers, invited Thomas to put his finger into the print of the nails, and to thrust his hand into his side; and very probably this is what Luke refers to, or that out of which the report which he recorded, originated.

But it is not irrational or unphilosophical to suppose that Jesus might invite some to handle him for the purpose of satisfying themselves of his yet being alive, and for the same cause prohibit others from doing so; and for the same reason he might invite the same person to do it at one time, and refuse to permit him to do it at another; for if he appeared only in his spiritual body, he would be able to appear to his disciples and others only according to the unfolding of *their* spiritual perceptions; and in the unfolding of their perceptions, they might be opened in sight only, or in sight and hearing, or in sight, hearing and feeling. Hence, while he could appear to one only in sight, he might appear to others in sight and feeling, etc.; therefore he might properly forbid Mary to touch him, for the same reason that he invited Thomas.

Is it said that the women returning from the tomb that morning met him on the way, and held him by the feet and worshiped him? There must be some mistake in Matthew in respect to that event, or Mark, Luke and John are mistaken. Mark says Jesus appeared first to Mary Magdalene; John says he appeared to Mary while she was at the tomb searching after the body; but when this took place, the other women had returned to the disciple and reported that they had seen a vision of angels, who had informed them of his resurrection, etc., but him they had not seen. So Cleophas and his companion said, according to Luke. Matthew is probably mistaken in that report, inasmuch as he can not well be true without contradicting the other three, who had as good means for knowing the truth as himself, as none of them were present, and therefore were obliged to rely upon report.

Is it objected that if my hypothesis be true that Jesus impressed his disciples with a falsehood, and purposely permitted them to believe that he had arisen from the dead in a sense in which he had not? This objection must be viewed in more aspects than one if we would understand well its true answer. It

is true that Jesus permitted his disciples to believe that his body had actually arisen from the tomb, and thus to believe in a fact which was not true according to their understanding of it. But he was in no way responsible for that false belief, nor could he correct it in them without involving them in a greater falsehood. He did not seek to prove to them that he had arisen in his physical body, but only that he was still alive. That was the great truth he had to reveal to them, and they translated it "that he was risen from the dead," because they could understand it in no other way—they could translate it into no other language.

The fact that those who believed in the immortality of the soul believed that it must be united with the physical body to preserve its identity, and that while it was separated therefrom it was in an unconscious condition, sometimes denominated "sleep," sometimes "resting from their labors," and such expressions—explains the reason why it was necessary that the disciples should believe in the literal resurrection of the body, in order that they might believe that Jesus was yet alive. It was the nearest approximation to the truth which they could make. The fact to be taught and demonstrated was a future conscious existence beyond the tomb, and not the mode or manner of that existence.

That such was the condition of mind they were in to make such an understanding necessary, will appear from Paul's argument in his letter to the Corinthian Church. There were those of Gentile and Saddusaic extraction who disputed the resurrection of the body, and were constantly starting difficulties to that doctrine: Paul's argument was addressed to them. After setting forth the fact of Jesus' death, burial, resurrection, and reciting the evidences of that fact, that he had been seen of Cephas, then of the twelve, then of five hundred brethren at once, then of James, then of all the apostles, and lastly of himself as one born out of due time. "Now," continues Paul, "if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that the dead rise not; but if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen; and if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching false, and your faith is also false; yea, and we are found false witnesses of God, for we have testified of God that he raised up Christ, whom he raised not up if so be that the dead rise not."

For if the dead rise not, then is Christ not raised; and if Christ be not raised your faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished. If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men the most miserable."

The purport of this argument can not be mistaken. Paul based the fact of man's immortality upon the fact of the resurrection of the body; that if the body was not to be raised, then those who had fallen asleep were perished—that is, censed to be. But God had proved to the contrary by raising up Christ from the dead, of which fact they were witnesses, and thus he had demonstrated the possibility of a corporeal resurrection, and by so doing had established the fact of man's immortality. Deny the resurrection, says Paul, and you annihilate man. This is the substance of his argument.

Hence, if Christ was "to bring life and immortality to light, that is, to the perception of his followers, there was no other way than to permit them to translate that truth into their own imperfect idea, leaving it to the work of time, development and spiritual influx, to correct the error of a literal resurrection.

The objection, then, that Christ permitted his disciples to believe in the literal resurrection of his body, reflects nothing against his character for truth and integrity. He uttered a great truth—his own and man's immortality; they translated by their ideal; and while they were right in the reception of that truth, they were wrong or false in the manner or form of receiving it; and in their condition of mind, Jesus could not correct the error of form without rooting out the substance. The tares were in the midst of the wheat, but they could not be rooted out without rooting out the wheat also; therefore they were left to grow together.

Jesus was obliged to indulge them in their false idea of his corporeal resurrection, for the same reason that he was obliged to leave them uncorrected in their false idea of his own character and mission. He knew that they had not understood one word of his teachings in respect to the kingdom he came to establish; that they were living in false hopes and expectations. He knew that almost every word he uttered was misunderstood and misir-

terpreted by them; nevertheless he did not correct them, because he could not correct them. They could not receive and understand the truth in its internal or spiritual significance.

The doctrine of the literal resurrection of the body is in its nature spiritualized materialism, and originated in the minds of those who were in a transition state from materialism to spirituality. It has its foundation in the idea that the physical body is somehow essential to conscious action, spiritual existence, and the true development and being of an immortal selfhood. Had I time, it would not be difficult to trace the rise and progress of this idea. The doctrine of transmutation, that is, changing one substance to another, is the false translation of a common phenomenon, of changing one form for another. The doctrine of a corporeal resurrection is the doctrine of transmutation, whereby the material is changed to the spiritual; the corruptible to the incorruptible; the mortal to the immortal; the dead to the living.

This brings me to the second part of my subject—the irrationality and absurdity of the doctrine of a corporeal resurrection. The proposition that the essentiality of one substance can be transmuted to another is a self-evident absurdity, and involves in it the elements of destruction, not only of the material universe but of God. Let it be demonstrated that there can be such a change as a transmutation of substance in its elemental existence, and you have demonstrated the existence of a principle which will ultimately involve the universe in ruins. Life and conscious being would ultimately become extinguished under the operation of such a principle. In nature, whenever the positive principle of action shall transmute the negative or receptive into itself, then will all action in nature cease, and everything will become a stagnant void. But I will not now dwell upon the consequences which would result to conscious and unconscious being, should such a principle be established. There are other things the common mind will more readily appreciate.

The doctrine of the resurrection and spiritualization of the physical body never has addressed itself to the rational perception of the mind; but on the contrary, it has ever appeared an absurd and mysterious proposition. Since the elemental composition of the body has been to any extent known, its materials have been

known to be essentially identical with the materials composing other animal and vegetable bodies. The oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen, carbon, alumina, the lime, the sulphur, etc., of which the body is composed, are not essentially permanent therein. They are constantly changing, so that the identical matter composing any material body years ago has passed away, and other matter has taken its place. After these portions of matter have left the body and become dissipated among the inorganic elements, they are no more related to my present body than to any other. They have nothing to do with my conscious being.

So also is it after my Spirit has left my body, and it has dissolved into its original elements. The gaseous portion has gone into the atmosphere and diffused itself among the general media. The oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen, carbon, etc., differ not at all from the same elements in the rock, the tree, or in other animals; and those portions once composing the human body now enter into the composition of other organisms, and not unfrequently enter other human bodies and become constituent portions of them, so that at the last, if the corporeal were to be reanimated, the same material would be claimed by many bodies. The earthly matter composing our bodies returns to dust, and differs not at all from its kindred dust, and the particles of dust once united in our bodies, having thus returned to their native earth, sustain no relation to each other different from other particles of the same earth. Thus it is that the doctrine of the literal resurrection of the physical body is irrational and philosophically absurd. To affirm that the physical body, having thus decayed and dissolved into its original elements, is to be reanimated, is to affirm that the elements of oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen, carbon, alumina, lime, phosphorus, sulphur, etc., are materials out of which Spirits are to be manufactured, and are essential for that purpose.

If this be true, the divine power would not find it necessary to call together the same identical particles, especially as they would be claimed by different persons; but any other particles, although they had never been in the human organism, would answer the purpose equally as well, as he would only need the raw material out of which to manufacture spiritual bodies. The idea, philosophically considered, is too absurd to require further comment.

There remains one other question to be considered, and that is: What became of the physical body of Jesus? Did his disciples steal it away, or did his enemies? I answer, neither. His body was removed by the same power that rolled back the stone from the door of the sepulcher. Had not his body been thus removed, the great system of truth which he taught would not have remained on earth a single year.

Had his body remained in the tomb and gone to decay, every disciple and follower of him would have given up, and gone each man to his own business. They would have remembered their former hopes and anticipations as only the delusions of their more ardent moments. No amount of evidence could have satisfied them that Jesus was yet alive, so long as his physical body lay mouldering in the tomb before their eyes. Jesus' death and disappearance was one of the most essential incidents of his mission to man, and without which all the rest would have failed. This he understood; and he told them that it was necessary that he should go away, and if they only knew him and his mission, they would rejoice at his saying.

The disciples knew not what became of his body, but supposed it was raised from the dead; the enemies knew not what became of it, but supposed the disciples had stolen it away. But the angels knew, but could not inform either friend or foe, without overthrowing in their minds their faith and hope upon which the future depended for a revelation of Jesus and his teachings. Gladly would they have revealed the truth freed from such errors, could the truth have been received. Gladly would they have gathered out the tares, could they have done it without rooting out the wheat. Jesus would gladly have told his little flock many things which he did not because they were not able to bear them; and in many other things he would gladly have corrected their erroneous views of him, of his mission and of the kingdom he came to establish. But they could not receive such truths, and for that cause he could not explain to them the true nature of his going away and coming again.

At some future time I will examine the subject of the resurrection in its internal and spiritual significance, when the gross-

ness and folly of the doctrine of a literal resurrection of the physical body will more forcibly appear.

There is another reason why the physical body is not to be re-animated, and that is—there is no occasion for any such thing. The body does not possess in itself any principle of thought or feeling. The principle of life and conscious being exists independent of the material body. So far as the body exerts any influence upon its conscious perceptions, that influence is to blind and embarrass. The material form in its influence upon the Spirit is that which now hides the Spirit world from our conscious perceptions; it is the *vail* through which we can not see.

The physical senses are but openings through the body by means of which the mind looks out upon existence, and when by any means any of these windows of the mind are closed up, so much of existence as falls within the range of such window is hidden from the mind.

When the Spirit is in any considerable degree freed from the influences of the body, its vision is greatly enlarged; its perceptions are quickened—it can realize more during a moment of its trancic condition than during years of its normal condition in the body. Those who have experienced even a temporary separation of the Spirit from the influences of the body would never think of resorting again to the material form to aid their mental power.

Nothing can be more self-evidently false to a mind unfolded in its spiritual vision than the idea that mind must depend upon the continuance of its physical body to preserve its conscious identity, or to aid its spiritual perception. Such a mind perceives that the farther it can be removed from the influences of its earliest and outmost form of existence, the nearer it can approach to internal or divine in its conscious perceptions; and it looks forward to the period of its physical dissolution as one which will open upon its enraptured vision a world of new truth, new beauty, and new happiness.

PHILOSOPHY OF SYMPATHY.

CONTINUED FROM ARTICLE, "PHENOMENA OF CLAIRVOYANCE," PAGE 85.

THE science of mathematics is denominated the true science, because by its principles everything which it asserts can be demonstrated to be true. The reason for this is, its principles are the necessary attributes of every form of existence. Nothing can exist not in perfect harmony with its truths. The universe, from the least particle of matter or spirit to the aggregate of all combined, is constructed and exists upon mathematical principles.

The principles of mathematics being the attributes of all existence, can be applied with absolute certainty when the nature of any particular existence is known. The operation of every law or principle in nature, when understood in its action or relation through any given quantity or space, can, by the aid of mathematical science, be understood through all quantities and spaces. Hence when the law of gravitation as applicable to the falling apple was understood, the same law, as applicable to worlds, suns and systems in their infinite distances and stupendous movements, was known and appreciated.

When the force of the gravity of our earth at its surface was known, its force at any distance from that surface could be estimated; when its force as applicable to any quantity of matter was known, its force as applicable to all quantities of matter could be ascertained; hence the mathematical philosopher can take his standpoint upon any portion of our earth, and weigh it, or weigh the sun and the entire system which whirls about it, and tell almost to a penny-weight its true weight; or he can take his stand at any point in space and tell the exact pressure with which our solar system bears upon that point.

Everything which exists must have motion, and in its move-

ments must pass over relative quantities of space in equal quantities of time; hence, in relation to other existences in motion, its motions must be commensurable or incommensurable. A thing, from the law of necessity, can not be commensurable and incommensurable with the same thing at the same time, any more than a thing can be equal and unequal to the same thing at the same time. Commensurability and incommensurability are the inevitable result of certain mathematical principles, and can not be destroyed; hence the law of commensurability must necessarily apply as well to the action of mind or spirit as to any other existence.

Harmony and discord in atmospheric undulations depend upon the commensurability or incommensurability of those undulations. So also mental or spiritual harmony or discord depend upon the commensurability or incommensurability of mental or spiritual motion. I have also taken the position that all thoughts and emotions of the mind are effects wrought upon the mind by influences exterior to the mind, or spontaneously by the action of the mind upon itself; that all effects imply a change, and that change implies motion; hence we are led to the inevitable conclusion that all thoughts or impressions are mental motions, caused by some power acting upon the mind, or by the spontaneous action of the mind upon itself. Now as all thoughts and emotions of the mind are the result of mental action or motion, they will also possess the same accidental qualities and conditions applicable to other motions—they will have their commensurable and incommensurable relations, which will result in producing harmony or discord in the mind or spiritual atmosphere.

The fact of the existence of these conditions between different portions of the same mind and also between different minds, has long been known and spoken of under the names of harmony and discord, without understanding the philosophy of those conditions. Thus, in speaking of a well-balanced mind, we often speak of its harmonious proportions and action—of an individual being in harmony with himself and others; we speak of restoring harmony of feeling between two individuals who have been angry with, or unfriendly to, each other; we speak of the harmony of neighborhoods, and families and individuals. Such

states or conditions as we denominate harmony between man and man, either in respect to their thoughts, feelings or interests, instinctively impress themselves upon the mind as being analogous to musical harmony; and hence, without understanding the true nature or philosophy of harmony, we have called them all by the same name. But we shall find, on careful examination, that the state or condition of mind or matter which has been denominated harmonious, rests upon one principle of commensurability and coincidence in form and motion.

We shall also find, on careful examination, that the different temperaments in that vital and mental constitution of man are different keys upon which mind and matter are individualized. Thus, on careful analogy, it will be found that there are but two temperaments, and that all others are combinations of these two; as in music there are but two keys, the major and the minor, although by the introduction of flats and sharps, almost every variety of key can be produced.

Sensations take their character from these conditions, and become pleasurable or painful according as their motions are harmonious or inharmonious. Joy or sorrow, enjoyment or suffering, happiness or misery are but the harmonious conditions of the unit man. None of these conditions could exist, were it not for certain relations which two or more existences sustain to each other. It is as necessary that that there should be a harmonious blending together of two or more actions in two or more existences to produce joy, enjoyment and happiness, as it is that there should be a blending together of two or more atmospheric undulations to produce harmony of sound; and it is also as necessary that there should be antagonism or incommensurability between the motions or actions of two or more existences to produce sorrow, suffering and misery, as it is that there should be incommensurable undulations to produce discord of sounds. Commensurability or harmony on the one hand always conduces to health, development and happiness; while incommensurability or discord, on the other hand, always tends to disease, wretchedness, misery and death.

Upon this same principle of harmonious or discordant relationship between two or more positive existences, is based the organ

of good and evil. Good and evil are not of themselves positive entities, maintaining an independent existence; they are mere conditions of existence, growing out of the relation they sustain to other existences. If there were but one existence in the universe, that existence could be neither good nor evil. From the very relation of things, it could not be any more than there could be harmony and discord where there is but one atmospheric undulation. A thing can only be said to be good in reference to the end to be accomplished by it, and its adaptedness to the accomplishment of that end; nor can it be said to be evil except in relation to its end and use. A thing is to be judged of in the light of its fruits. Thus Christ said, "By their fruits shall ye know them." Thus good and evil are in their nature like harmony and discord, both conditions depending on relations, and not principles or entities of themselves.

Hence, in all discussions and investigations which have been based upon the hypothesis that good and evil were positive existences, men have never been able to arrive at any satisfactory conclusions; because their premises being false, their conclusions could not be true, and consequently they landed in falsehood and absurdity. For example: One class of theologians, assuming that God alone was all-wise, powerful and good, and also that he alone was self-existent and eternal, have found it impossible, on rational grounds, to account for the origin of evil, consistent with the existence and attributes of God. That evils existed in the widest and most hateful forms throughout all the departments of nature with which man was connected, could not be denied. But whence came it? Is it coexistent with God? Is its age eternity, and its habitation infinity? If so, what becomes of the ubiquity and omnipotence of God; if not, who brought it into existence? How could evil be produced when there was nothing but the perfectly pure and the perfectly good in existence? Is God directly or indirectly the parent of evil? That would conflict with his perfect benevolence? The difficulty is not obviated by the introduction of an evil Spirit or genii; for unless perfect holiness and purity could beget evil, there could have been nothing to tempt an angel to sin. Out of pure, unmixed holiness and purity sin can not arise.

But when we come to understand that good and evil are not entities or positive existences of themselves, then the mystery is solved. Good and evil being conditions growing out of the relationship of one existence to another, it is no more difficult to account for their origin than it is to account for the origin of harmony and discord, of commensurability and incommensurability; and the all-wise, powerful and good is no more responsible for the existence of evil than he is for the existence of discord in musical sounds, or incommensurability between two lines; nor does it impeach the power of God to say that he could not make all sounds harmonious or all lines commensurable, any more than to say he can not lie or change his own mode of existence or action.

And it is nothing short of heathenism to institute an evil spirit or genii as the parent of evil, to enable us to account for its origin. We might as truthfully institute a spirit or genii for every condition or relation in existence, and thus again re-people the earth with the ten thousand imaginary gods of primal barbarism. If we are to have a god of evil, why not a god of discord, a god of war, a god of deformity, etc., etc., and in short a god for every separate condition and relation in existence. Egypt was famed for the number and variety of her gods; but even Egypt was deficient in number and variety, if this principle of deifying condition is to prevail. When I come to speak of religion, the divinity of its origin and mission, I shall dwell more at length on this subject; in the mean time, permit me to submit certain questions for the consideration of those who introduce an evil Spirit to account for the origin and continuance of evil. If there is a personal Devil, whence comes he? Did he come into existence by the agency, approbation and consent of the Almighty, or without that agency, approbation and consent? And being in existence, has God power to banish him from the universe? and if so, why does he not exercise that power? Does the good of the universe require his continuance in it? If so, then is not the Devil a positive good? If not, then does not the fact of continuance impeach either the omnipotence or benevolence of God?

The philosophy of harmony being understood as being the commensurable relation which one motion sustains to another,

and thoughts, feelings, etc., being understood as mental motions, the same conditions of harmony and discord will be found to exist in the mind, and between mind and mind, as exist in the physical atmosphere; and the pleasurable and painful emotions of the mind will be found to be based upon this principle. Thus mental attraction or spiritual affinity depends upon this same principle of harmony. Those minds producing commensurable undulations in the spiritual atmosphere and nervous aroma harmonize, and are naturally attracted or drawn toward each other. They sympathize and feel agreeable in the society of each other. Almost all have felt this when among entire strangers. There are those for whom we feel a sympathy, and toward whom we are attracted by an influence to us unaccountable. There is a silent influence, amounting almost to a charm, which impels us to seek an acquaintance.

On the contrary, those minds which produce incommensurable undulations are naturally repelled and driven from each other. They feel unpleasant and disagreeable in the society of each. All have felt this kind of influence among strangers, and might travel in their company for days or even weeks, without feeling any especial sympathy for, or interest in, them. This phenomenon is most strikingly manifested in the case of sympathetic clairvoyance, where, from the extreme susceptibility of the subject, these mental or spiritual undulations are clearly perceived. It is not unfrequent that the presence of certain individuals is the source of great pain and disquietude to them, and they become extremely impatient and nervous until the irritating mind is removed.

All are not equally susceptible to these impressions. Some can scarcely perceive them; others not at all. One mind may feel itself attracted toward another, and yet the other feel no such influence. The difference is in their degrees of susceptibility, joined with external causes and influences which may surround each. Thus one mind may feel the harmonious influence of the other without the other's perceiving anything of it; or the other may be more strongly attracted in another direction, or may be repelled by personal appearance, foolish or silly conduct, or false

impressions of character, etc. Thus the fact that all do not feel the same attractions or repulsions may be easily explained.

This difference between individuals, of mental and vital undulation, taken as a whole, constitutes the individual, and is owing to the constitutional structure formed during the entire process of individualization. As the totality of circumstances or incidents attending an individual from the time of his birth to his death can not in all respects be alike in any two individuals, so no two individuals can, from the nature of things, be precisely alike in their mental and vital constitutions; and this very difference constitutes their individuality or identity.

This difference of constitutional structure is commenced in the womb. The leading features of the mental and vital constitution of the mother will be stamped upon the child, unless surrounding circumstances compel a deviation. This may be done by influences affecting the mind of the mother at the time of conception, or during the period of gestation. But those influences must be of a strong exciting character, and must make an impression of considerable duration. Influences of this kind have often been witnessed, and their effect upon the features, form, vital and mental constitution of the offspring, are to a considerable extent known. Our medical journals are full of cases of this kind, and are all acquainted with instances of what are familiarly called "marking children."

These facts should be attentively studied, and the important truths they teach should make a deep impression on our minds. We notice the influence of the mental and vital condition of the mother on the child only in very marked cases; but we are not then to infer that her mental and vital condition do not affect the child only in those marked cases. On the contrary, we are to learn that every influence, however slight, which affects the condition of the mother, makes its impress on the vital and spiritual constitution of the offspring. In fact, no influence can mark the infant during the period of gestation, except through the vital and mental system of the mother; hence the new-born infant is but a sum of all the influences controlling the mother during the period of its foetal development. If, during this period, the prevailing condition of the mother be of an intellectual

and moral character; if her body be in a healthy condition, and her mind be harmoniously exercised by all the higher and ennobling impulses of truth and virtue, fortunate will it be for the germinating immortal; but if of the contrary character, it will be unfortunate indeed; for in this way are the sins of parents visited upon their children, down through all future generations.

As the child derives its first vital and spiritual constitution from its mother, if there be no influence to cause a temporary deviation, its vital and spiritual constitution will be built up in harmony with that of the mother, and this harmony is the foundation of that instinctive attachment which at once springs up between them. The individualization of the child, in that early stage, is necessarily built up in harmony with the mother, and hence mutual sympathy and affection must at once exist. The chords of affection and love so unite their two hearts, it can not be told where the one begins or the other ends. Their heart-strings are the same; hence there is nothing so tender, so unselfish and holy as a mother's love; and if that mother has not all-controlling influence over that child, the fault is her own. If the child ever comes to hate that mother, it will be the penalty of a mother's sins.

Upon this condition of vital and spiritual harmony also depend the sympathy and affection of the family circle, extending through fathers, mothers, brothers and sisters. Harmonious relations existing between the parents, they unitedly impress the same condition upon their offspring. Their children are individualized upon the same general principles. Different surrounding circumstances, which impress themselves upon the parent during the first stages of the individualization of each child, will account for the difference in feature and disposition of each. Being brought up together under the same paternal and maternal roof and influence, they begin, and for a time continue, under the same general circumstances, and therefore receive the same general constitutions; hence naturally they harmonize and are attached to each other by the chords of sympathy, affection and love. If children are discordantly developed, and hate each other, or are wickedly selfish in respect to each other's interests,

it forms a bad commentary on the harmonious action and relation of their parents. The same condition of harmony and sympathy may be traced throughout the whole circle of relationship, so far as the constitutional characteristics of the parents' sins are preserved in their progeny.

The observation of almost every individual will demonstrate the truth of the foregoing position; hence arise many reflections it is proper for us to pause and consider. The position occupied by parents, as charged with the responsibility of giving birth to immortality of character and constitution, is not to be trifled with. The importance of being in harmony with themselves, and surrounding themselves with harmonious influences, can not be too seriously attended to. The business of begetting offspring should be a matter of high and holy principle and love, and not of low, groveling, sensual lust. The mind of the mother during the period of gestation, should be harmoniously exercised with thoughts, feelings and emotions which are pure, lofty and ennobling. The highest and best faculties of the soul should be called into constant exercise, unmixed with anything which is low, discordant or sensual. No discordant or disturbing influence should be permitted to tread even the threshold of that "SANCTUM SANCTORUM," a mother's breast, much less be permitted to enter in and dwell there; because all such influences will make their stamp upon the imperishable constitution of the germinating immortal.

Marriages as now contracted, under the influence of avarice, sensuality and lust, are adulterous and incestuous, and are despised by God, and should be by man. Nature rebels and inflicts her severest penalties for such unholy sins upon both parents and offspring. Marriages depending for their existence upon contract merely, when the consideration is of a low, animal, avaricious or sensual character, although ratified by a priest in the assumed name of God, and attended by all the external pomp and ceremony of a religious ritual, are nothing more or less than legalized adulteries, not legalized by heaven, but by man. To pretend that such marriages are made in heaven, or that God has joined such hearts together, is little short of blas-

phemy. It is more nearly allied to the botched work of man, presumptuously assuming to do the work of God, than to a heavenly marriage.

All true marriages are made in heaven, and are formed by united, harmonious souls. The spiritual harmony existing between them has united and connected them together; and in reality, in all their loves, sympathies and affections, "they twain are one flesh." They are such as God has joined together by the constitutional elements of their very being, and such unions man can not put asunder.

This subject also affords important suggestions in reference to the education of our children. Education is the author of development, and gives character to the immortal constitution. It is the food of the mind, and is wholesome or unwholesome according as it is true or false. Every influence by which the mind is surrounded, and which exerts its effect upon it, becomes a portion of its education. Those influences which do not harmonize with the eternal progression of the Spirit in the unfolding of its love and wisdom, are prejudicial to the proper development of mind. Those influences which tend to excite the animal passions, appetites and desires beyond the great and prudent demands of nature, cheat the soul of a portion of its birthright. Those influences which make vice popular and crime reputable, and thus remove out of the way to wickedness the strong barrier of an enlightened and virtuous public sentiment, are most deplorable in their consequences.

Nothing can be more prejudicial to the proper education and development of mind than the influences of our civil governments. They are framed professedly for the purpose of enforcing the observance of right between man and man, and yet in their modes of existence and action they are at war with every spiritual principle of our natures; they trample upon every fundamental principle of Christianity; they are based upon the selfish individuality of man, and consequently antagonize with everything which would tend to develop and unfold his spiritual nature; consequently they are a fruitful source of more wrong than they pretend to redress.

Family government is a part of the educational process of the

young immortal, and must not conflict with the great law of love and harmony. If parents are what they are bound to be to meet their responsibilities, there will never be any discord in the family circle; if they harmonize with themselves in spirit and in truth, they will impress that harmony upon their offspring, and thus obtain an influence over them which it will be a sin to lose. If parents are not in harmony with themselves, they are verily guilty if they attempt to beget offspring. The difference between a well-governed family when love impels the will, where mildness, gentleness and love always preside, where kind words of encouragement and instruction are heard, where mild and gentle reproofs are administered—and one where anger, rage and passion preside, where force and fear hold the reins of government, where for every fault there is an outburst of anger and passion, a constant contact of sticks, backs and heads, vociferations of throats and screaming of children, rising in one confused din—is like the difference between paradise and pandemonium. It is a universal principle in nature that like begets like; from the eternal constitution of things it must be so. Hence love begets love, kindness kindness, and gentleness gentleness; while on the other hand anger begets anger, rage rage, and hate hate. "They that take the sword shall perish by it," is the decree of nature as well as of God.

When we consider the accidental and fortuitous manner in which marriages are entered into, the discordant material thus thrown together; the sensual and lustful manner in which the parties often live; the ignorance, discord and depravity which abound; the distracting influences which reign in the mother's breast during the period of gestation; the war of spiritual elements into which the child is born; the ignorance, unskillfulness and sensuality of its teachers, it is wonderful beyond conception that discord and evil have not reigned triumphant in the human breast—that the image of God has not been effaced from the human constitution. But the fact that a good degree of harmony yet prevails throughout the department of universal existence, is proof positive of the dominion of an omnipotent power which will in the end bring all into harmony and consequent unity, perfectness and happiness. And nature proclaims that unbe-

liever and infidel in faith, who would impeach the wisdom, love and power of the great Artificer of the universe by proclaiming a contrary doctrine.

Keeping in view the great condition of harmony in the spiritual atmosphere as a means of transmitting influences from mind to mind, we can understand many phenomena which otherwise appear unaccountable and mysterious. Thus all the manifestations of public excitement or sympathy are referable to these principles, and by carefully attending to them we can learn how to create, and how to destroy these excitements.

That which tends to assimilate mind in its leading characteristics, tends to produce harmony in those minds; and the greater the number of minds thus assimilated and acting in concert, the greater will be the influence and power they will exert over other minds. They together form a compound battery, and act with great power upon the spiritual atmosphere, and through that upon minds about them; and when a large number of minds are thus assimilated in thought, feeling and desire, and act in concert to one end, strong in individuality must he be who can resist their influence.

This assimilation of mind must be in relation to the *end* to be accomplished, and the *means* by which it is to be accomplished; that is, there must be an assimilation of the *will* and the *wisdom* of the mind. When this assimilation has taken place, the intensity of the action will depend upon the motive power applied. That motive power may be love, or hate, or any of the misguided and misdirected passions of the animal nature. Hence the quality or character of any public excitement depends upon what *impels* and what *directs*. If love impels and true wisdom directs, the result will be good; for pure love and true wisdom can not be the parents of evil. But if love impels or ignorance directs, or hate impels and wisdom directs—the result must be bad for the offspring of love and ignorance, or hate and wisdom, must be impious and unholy. "A good tree can not bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit." Hence in all cases of great public excitement, whether political, civil or religious, the same principles must be observed, the same

conditions must be complied with; there must be an assimilation of mind upon the end, means and motive.

The truth of these positions will be fully illustrated by attending to the various phenomena exhibited during religious excitements. I take an example of this kind for an illustration, because the people are more familiar with the details of such an excitement than of almost any other; and because in such cases there is usually the most perfect assimilation of minds in their motives, means and end; and, furthermore, I have no hesitation in selecting a case of this kind at this time, because experience has taught the world, both in the church and out of it, that these spasmodic efforts to extend the power and influence of religion are, to say the least, unprofitable to the interests of true piety,

The first thing to be obtained preparatory to a religious excitement is a strong mental battery to throw out its undulations into the spiritual atmosphere. To form this battery many minds must be used, and these minds must be brought into a state of spiritual harmony with each other. The first condition to be obtained is unity of thought, unity of feeling, unity of desire and unity of expectation as to the end and means to be used for getting up the revival. There should be a leading mind to give the keynote or pitch, with which the rest are to harmonize. But before they can harmonize, mutual faith and confidence must be established. If there is anything which prevents this, it must be removed out of the way. If any two or more members out of whom this battery is to be formed, distrust each other, or cherish unkindly feelings, they must become reconciled or leave the circle. Individuality of feeling must give way, and a united feeling, desire and sympathy must take its place. As in the most skillful and well-practiced choir, one discordant voice would destroy the harmony of the whole, or as in the magnetic battery, one plate out of place will discharge the whole battery, so one discordant mind will destroy the power of this spiritual battery. Therefore great care must be taken in the construction of the battery to see that no discordant mind is thrust in the way.

That which tends to prevent assimilation in the minds of those forming the battery, is selfish individuality. So long as this is

maintained, assimilation can not take place. Therefore self-abasement of spirit, humble trust and dependence, deep humility and a yielding disposition are necessary preparatory exercises, because they unbend the mind, and tend to dissolve this stubborn individuality, and place each in a condition to be molded into harmony with the rest. For this purpose also, it is necessary that there should be great heart searchings, to ascertain if anything of individuality remains, or to use the common expression, "to see if anything is kept back." Confessions of sins, penitence for the same, and hearty forgiveness are indispensable. When these preliminary steps have been taken, and the minds thus brought into harmony, the battery is ready for action.

After the battery is thus prepared and has commenced its action, its influence will be felt by those even who are ignorant of its existence. So many minds unitedly putting forth their strongest desires and aspirations cannot fail to make strong movement in the spiritual atmosphere, which will be felt by minds susceptible to its influence. A something will be heard, speaking as with an ethereal tongue; undefined thoughts, feelings, emotions, solemn as eternity, and cloud-like, will overshadow the mind; the attention will be arrested; the mind will look within to inquire the cause of this internal commotion, and this very effort will call it off from exterior influences, and make it more susceptible to these impressions. As the battery works upon these undulations they will continue to beat upon the already agitated mind. The conflict now going on is between the individuality of the subject and these spiritual undulations.

If the latter prove the stronger, emotions, thoughts, strange, awful and unaccountable, will continue to throng upon the mind, and in the midst of this commotion he will be constrained to exclaim, "What shall I do?" He tries to yield, to give up his will, to submit; but his very effort causes him to maintain his individuality; and it is not until he gives up all further effort of his own, relying solely on the mercy and goodness of God, and in his imagination casting himself passively at the foot of the cross, that individuality gives way, resistance ceases, and he hopes that he is born again. A flood of harmony, producing joy unspeakable, rushes through his soul, and he feels that he is a new creature.

This joy and peace is occasioned by a restoration of spiritual harmony incident to the individuality of the mind yielding to the strong thrilling undulations of this spiritual atmosphere, combined with an exalted hope, and a belief that all is now safe.

As entire harmony was necessary to commence the work, so also is it necessary for the continuance of it. In religious excitements, everything which tends to arouse individuality of feeling or interest must be carefully excluded, and it matters not whether the individuality of feeling or interest be in reference to personal interest or sect. Hence experience has taught those concerned in conducting revivals, that in the prosecution of this work everything like sectarian feeling and influence must be laid aside. Nothing must be agitated except those doctrines upon which all can agree. Those peculiar views which distinguish them as sects must not be discussed. Unless these conditions are complied with, they can not co-operate, and the work can not progress. Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, etc., must agree to drop their sectarian differences, and in the prosecution of their work cease to be Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, etc., and be only Christians. However important the Baptist may deem his mode of baptism to be, as he would see the revival progress, he must say nothing about it, for that would arouse the individuality of the Presbyterian and Methodist. Whatever danger the Methodist may perceive there is, that the young convert will fall from grace, he must withhold his warning admonition, for that would arouse the individuality of the Baptist and Presbyterian, and so on.

But when the work has so far progressed as to bring forth many converts, and the time comes for gathering them into the churches, then these sectarian differences make their appearance, and from that time the revival is at an end. Individuality of sect stands forth, and discussion, argument and disputation take the place of prayer and song. There is no longer an assimilation of their minds in their thoughts, feelings and desires as to the motive, means and end of their labors, but each sect assumes a position antagonistic to the others, and thus the spiritual battery is destroyed.

Thus it is with all popular excitements. The same conditions being complied with, revivals can be had by Pagans, Mahomme-

dans, Mormons. The imagination can work upon this spiritual atmosphere, and awaken undulations peculiar to itself. As the physical atmosphere will undulate to convey a falsehood as well as the truth, so also will the spiritual atmosphere. It is the mental motion, whether true or false, which communicates the undulation to this medium. Mobs are produced on the principle of mental batteries, and can be dispersed by deranging or destroying the battery. Throw discord into the leading minds, and the hooting crowd will go home. Let distraction prevail in the mobic council, and there will be an end of mob force.

Upon this same principle prayer, which is active desire, is potent for good when rightly understood. By this I do not mean prayer written and tied to a stick that it may be offered by flitting in the wind; nor do I mean such prayers as are made standing in the synagogues or corners of the streets to be seen or heard of men; or those cold and formal prayers offered to fulfill a duty; or from habit, or such prayers as are uttered in a foreign or dead language; or by counting beads, or anything of the kind. But I mean such pure simple, earnest, honest, desire as flows spontaneously from the heart, and finds expression not only in the words, but in the actions of the individual. I mean that desire which moves the deepest fountains of the soul, and sends out its clear, distinct, harmonious undulations in the spiritual atmosphere, such as angels and God can hear.

In this spiritual atmosphere, disembodied Spirits find a medium of communication not only among themselves, but also with minds inhabiting the form; and through the undulations of this medium they become cognizant of our thoughts and desires, as they go forth for relief when we are in distress. The intensity of these spiritual undulations depends upon the intensity of our thoughts and desires. When our case is urgent, and our thoughts and desires are ardent, a strong undulatory movement is communicated to this medium which notifies all surrounding Spirits of our necessities, and they endeavor to come to our aid. This they can only do by operating upon the minds of those in the body, and impressing them to come to our assistance. They severally apply themselves to the work; and if they can find any to whom they can gain sufficient access to make the necessary impression,

they send them to our relief. Thus many a prayer has been answered, and many a destitute being has been relieved through the efforts of Spirits made in their behalf.

Look at the poor widow whose little ones are crying for food, and she has none to give them. Hear her pray with all that fervency and anguish of soul which none but mothers can feel for perishing babes: "Father, give us this day our daily bread." Angels heard that prayer; and as the ministering Spirits of God they flew on wings of charity and love to move some soul in her behalf. Look again; see that kind neighbor just entering her door with his basket of provisions for her hungry little ones. Ask him what influenced him to think upon that poor family at that particular time? He will tell you frankly he does not know. But somehow, while sitting quietly by his fire, enjoying his ease, the thought was suddenly impressed upon him that this poor family might be suffering for food, and he ought to go to their relief; that yielding to the impression he went. He does not dream that guardian Spirits who tend on mortals for their good, seized upon that favorable opportunity to make that impression upon his mind. He does not know that he was the messenger of Spirits, and that they also rejoiced in the success of their mission. But so it was, and he not only carried relief and joy to the bosom of that poor family, but he carried rejoicings into the angelic spheres.

The great beauty which will be discovered in this philosophy consists in its utter simplicity and usefulness. The entire class of mental or spiritual phenomena are explained by application of a few simple principles; and these principles have their analogy or correspondence throughout all nature. What can be more simple or truthful than the proposition that for any cause to produce an effect it must be connected with the effect? and that which connects them must be such in its mode of existence and action as to be capable of being acted upon by the thing affected. The truth of this proposition is illustrated and demonstrated by every operation in nature, and there is and can be no exception to it. Again, what can be more self-evident than the proposition that every effect is the result of a change in the thing affected, and that this change implies motion, etc.? What can be more simple

and truthful than the existence of an unindividualized spiritual medium, filling all space, and connecting every mind in the universe with every other mind?—that thought, feeling, etc., are mental or spiritual motions which may be communicated to, and transmitted through, this spiritual medium?—that as a medium it possesses the laws and accidental properties analogous to other media, and of which other media are correspondential?

PROPOSITIONS.

ALL sin consists in coming into, and continuing, and acting in, such conditions and relations as bring the individual in some department of his being under the action of a law not suited to ultimating the perfect destiny of such individual.

Hence sin begets no new action in respect to the power punishing it, but brings the sinner into a condition and relation where the law can only act to punish.

Hence, if the power is omnipotent to bless when in true condition and relation, it must, by the same power, curse whatever is in false relation and condition. For there is but one true condition and relation under which the power can act to bless. All others must antagonize.

MAN could not possess an affection for falsehood did he not possess a nature having perception and affection for that which is beneath the sphere of truth, and which in its highest destiny does not demand truth as such.

Hence man's affection for falsehood has a real basis within him, which basis is just and necessary within its sphere, and if exercised within its sphere only, would not result in evil.

Hence man has a nature within him indispensable to his being, which is not suited for the perception of, or of an affection for, the truth.

Hence falsehood has its basis in such nature.

PLEA FOR CHRISTIANITY.

As a part of this plea, I propose to establish the following propositions respecting the person and character of Jesus of Nazareth :

1st. He claimed to be one with the Father, in his life, in the character of his loves and delights, and that all who sought redemption through his system must become one with the Father in the same sense in which he was one with him.

2d. He did not claim to be one, or equal, with the Father in the individuality of his being, either in his origin, wisdom or power; but in those respects he claimed to have the common origin with man, to wit: a derivative being, wisdom and power; and what he was, man could become by living the true life.

3d. Whenever Jesus spake of himself in respect to his office or mission, he represented himself as a teacher, a pattern, an exemplar. He often identified himself with his system, and spake of it as though he were speaking of himself; and he often did so without any reference to his individual being.

4th. Our fourth position is that he did not pretend to be typified by the Jewish Ceremonial Law, nor did he in his life or teachings intend to create any such idea in his disciples or any other person. He did not teach in letter or Spirit that he came to become an atoning sacrifice between man and God, and that faith in him as such sacrifice, was necessary to salvation. And no person during his lifetime so understood him to teach, and the faith of those who believed in him did not include any such idea, nor did he intend that any such idea of his office and mission should be obtained from his teachings.

5. Our fifth position is that he taught that whosoever should be

lieve in his system and practice it, could work the works which he did, and even greater works; and that the power and wisdom which he manifested were naturally evolved through the development of his personal being, without any *special* agency of God.

The truth of the foregoing positions can not be successfully controverted. Christ often claimed to be one with the Father; that he did the works of his Father; that he was engaged in his Father's business; that he was ever subject to the will of God. But in thus speaking of himself, he ever had strict reference to his character in his loves, delights and impulses to action. He lived in the celestial department of his being; all his desires and aspirations, and all his activity proceeded therefrom. The external, that is, the physical and intellectual nature, in him was brought into perfect subjection to the celestial and Divine; and hence he was emphatically the son and begotten of God, because in all his being he was identified with that department of his personality which united him with God.

In his first discourse of which we have any account, he commenced by describing the condition of mind necessary to be attained to bring man into divine harmony, to which condition he had attained, and thus he spake from the stand-point occupied by himself. The condition thus described was that of meekness, poverty in spirit, merciful, peaceful and pure in heart, hungering and thirsting after righteousness, rejoicing in tribulations and persecutions for the sake of righteousness.

Here is a description of character belonging to the individual who lives in his inmost or divine nature; one who has overcome the arrogance, pride and haughtiness of the animal; one who has subdued the cruel and turbulent selfishness of the external man; one whose love of self is merged in the love of righteousness, justice, purity and truth; one who would never hope for reconciliation with God, so long as he was unreconciled to his fellow-man.

This condition of mind—that is, this character thus described—consisted in being in the positive of all good and in the negative of all evil; that is, consisted in being in the Divine. The impulse to all action should be love—pure, holy, unselfish; the

guide to all activity should be truth, the end of all activity should be righteousness.

The coming into this condition of mind is what Christ denominated perfection, and it was the only perfection he claimed. Said he, referring to this kind of perfection, "Ye have heard that it hath been said, thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them who despitefully use you and persecute you, that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven; for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust. For if ye love them which love you, what reward have ye? Do not even the publicans the same? And if ye salute your brethren only, what do ye more than others? do not even the publicans so? Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect."

This perfection of the divine character which Christ claimed for himself and which he urged his disciples to possess, consisted in treating all with kindness, gentleness and love, regardless of their external characters. It was this spirit and temper of mind which was to make them in their characters CHILDREN of God.

It was in reference to their coming into this condition of mind that he taught the necessity of the new birth—the birth of the Divine Spirit. This doctrine of the new birth was the first doctrine he taught after the commencement of his public ministry. Man naturally was under the dominion of his animal and intellectual nature, and his impulses to activity proceeded therefrom. In his external being he was subject to the influence of motives, and acted therefrom; hence in all his actions based upon external influences, he acted from the external and imperfect. He was in a greater or less degree selfish. This was the *natural* or *water* birth which connected him with the external universe of matter and mind, and under the prevailing influence of this external nature, he could perceive only the external of the universe. Hence it was, that unless he should be born again—be born into, or come into, the interior or Divine, he could not perceive the kingdom of heaven. The *external* could not reveal it in its *internal* character and significance.

Said Christ in reply to the inquiry of Nicodemus, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit." That which is of the flesh or of the external can perceive the things of the external, and that which is born of the Spirit or the internal can perceive the things of the *internal*. "Marvel not that I say unto you, ye must be born again. The wind bloweth where it listeth, and ye hear the sound thereof, but can not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit."

Here is the great doctrine of the *external* and the *internal* in man set forth by Christ as he perceived it. Those things which impressed the external in man could be externally perceived. The physical and intellectual could trace the source of their impressions. But not so with the internal. The man living in the internal could feel the impress of truth upon his soul, could hear the inaudible voice speaking of the truths of the Divine, could feel the rush of light and life and joy, but could not tell whence it came or whither it went. But without being brought into the Divine, he could not perceive these things. Unless man would live in the ruling loves and delights of the divine nature, he could not see the kingdom of God.

And here I will make a passing remark upon the explanation usually given to this new birth as taught and practiced by formal Christians. To them this new birth, usually denominated a change of heart, is a mysterious affair, and it is supposed to be typified by the rite of baptism. They consider the expression "be born of water" as referring to water baptism; but a careful examination of the subject will demonstrate that such is the very opposite of its true signification. There are but two births spoken of, the *natural* and the *spiritual*. The *natural* birth is what gives the being *individuality*; without that he would have had no existence as a personal being. This natural birth connects him with the external universe, or the universe of divine manifestation. The spiritual birth brings him into the Divine, and connects him with the Divine Being in his perceptions and loves. The natural birth is the one represented as being born of water; that is, material. The rite of baptism was not designed as a water birth, but on the contrary, as a death and burial of the natu-

ral man in his lusts, passions, affections, etc., and as a resurrection into a new or spiritual life, thereby coming into new loves, delights and affections, to wit, those of the Divine. But this will more fully appear when I treat upon the doctrines of primitive Christianity.

This inmost nature in man, which has heretofore been described as being divine; that is, God in man, is the one in which Christ lived, and from which he acted; and it was into this nature that Christ sought to bring man, and the character or condition of mind before described belonged to this inmost or divine nature; and when that character was exhibited in the life of man, that furnished evidence that the individual was living in the divine nature, and hence Christ pronounced such "*blessed*." Such he called perfect, because they were living in the perfect or Divine, and in all their activity they were impelled by the Divine. It was in this that his own perfections consisted, and in this sense he called himself the *son of God*, and in the same sense he called all who should thus live the *sons of God*. In this view he prayed that those who should believe in him might become one *in him* as he was one *with God*.

My second proposition is that Christ did not claim to be one with God or equal to the Father in the personality of his being, either in his origin, wisdom or power. But in those respects he claimed to have the common origin of man, to wit, a derivative being, a derivative wisdom, and a derivative power, and that what he was man could become by living the true life.

The truth of this second position will be perceived, whenever Christ speaks of himself as an individual being. It is important to notice the manner of Christ's speaking when referring to himself, in order to ascertain whether he is speaking of his personal being or of his system of doctrines. In speaking of himself as a personal being, he describes himself as the *son of man*; when speaking of himself in the light of his character and the system of truth he was teaching, he usually described himself as the *son of God*.

Whenever he spoke of himself as separate from the wisdom he taught and the power he exercised, he invariably placed himself in the position of a recipient, and declared explicitly that of

himself he could do nothing." Said he, speaking of the power which he exercised, "The works which I do I do not of myself, but the Father which dwelleth in me he doeth the work;" and said he also, "Whosoever believeth on me and keepeth my sayings, the works that I do shall he do also, and greater works than these shall he do."

Said Christ, also referring to his knowledge or wisdom, "The son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the Father do," and again, "I can of my own self do nothing; as I hear I judge." "For I have not spoken of myself, but the Father which sent me he gave me a commandment what I should say or what I should speak." And again, "Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not even the son, but the Father."

My third proposition is that whenever Christ spake of himself in respect to his office and mission, he represented himself as a teacher, a pattern, an exemplar, that he often identifies himself with his system, and speaks of his system as though he were speaking of himself. Said he, speaking of his mission, "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world that I should bear witness unto the truth;" again, "I am the light of the world." In speaking of his system as though he were speaking of himself he said, "He that believeth on me though he were dead, yet shall he live;" and again, "He that keepeth my sayings, shall never taste of death;" and again, "I am the bread of life; he that cometh to me shall never hunger, and he that believeth in me shall never thirst." "This is the bread that cometh down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread he shall live forever, and the bread which I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." "Verily I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life; for my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood dwelleth in me and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me shall live by me." Again, speaking of his system he says, "I am the way, the truth and the life;" "No man can come unto the Father but by me." Again, "Before Abraham

was I am;" again, "I am the door," "I am the vine," etc.; and there are a multitude of such expressions which Christ made use of in referring to the system of divine truth which he taught, which, if obeyed, would bring man into the interior or Divine.

These remarks in which Christ likened himself to food, such as bread and meat, etc., were intended to express the intimate nearness into which those who expected the benefits of his system must come to him in his teachings and practices. As food could only nourish and develop the physical system by being eaten, digested, assimilated and incorporated into the physical system, and thus become a part of the individual himself, so his doctrines could give life only by being received into the spiritual system, digested, assimilated and incorporated into the system itself as a part and parcel of it. Hence the significance of the last supper he eat with his disciples, when he taught them that as often as they eat and drank to nourish their physical systems, they should keep him, that is, his teachings and practices, in remembrance, to nourish and develop their spiritual natures.

It was in the above sense that Christ said, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." He meant not that those who had seen him in his physical person had seen God, but those who had seen him in his spiritual character, in the divinity of his teachings, in his character for fidelity, purity, truth and love. Those who had only seen him in his personality, were like those who had heard his external language without perceiving the internal meaning thereof. Such had eyes but they saw not, and ears but they heard not; and hearts but they could not understand.

My fourth proposition is that Christ did not claim to have been typified by the ceremonial law of the Jews, nor did he, in his life or teachings, intend to create any such ideal in the minds of his disciples or any other person. He did not teach in letter or spirit that he came to be an atoning sacrifice between man and God, and that faith in him as such sacrifice was necessary to salvation.

This proposition is sufficiently maintained by the fact that no such allusion was ever made by him when speaking of himself or of his mission; and furthermore, neither his disciples nor any

other person ever understood him as teaching any such doctrine during the time he continued with them. He required those who sought his healing aid to have faith in him, and often told them that it was their faith that had healed them; but they had no faith in him as an atoning sacrifice, for they did not understand that he was to be sacrificed. They did not understand that any sacrifice on his part was necessary.

His disciples were required to believe on him, and they did believe on him as the Christ. But they did not understand or believe that he was to be sacrificed; and when he was crucified they were totally confounded, and gave up all as lost; and when they became satisfied that he had arisen from the dead, they believed that he was to become their perpetual king. The idea that he was the Lamb of God, sacrificed to make an atonement, did not arise until years after many who believed on him as the Messiah had died. Stephen the first martyr, and James, who were slain for preaching the new faith, had no faith in Christ as the atoning sacrifice, or as God incarnated to die for man.

This phase of faith, so far as it existed at all in the minds of the apostles and others, did not arise until during the latter part of the apostolic age, and thousands died in faith in Christ as the promised Messiah, who had no faith in him as an atoning sacrifice. This doctrine was no part of the system taught by Christ, and is not a Christian doctrine. It is the old Jewish ideal of an angry God thirsting for blood, incorporated into the Christian system by those who were not developed to the sphere of Christ's real teachings.

My fifth proposition is, that he taught that whoever should believe in his system and practice it, could work the works which he did and even greater works, and that the power which he exercised was naturally evolved through the development of his personal being without any especial agency of God.

All power in the universe emanates directly or indirectly from the Divine Being; even the power which is manifested in the universal kingdom proceeds indirectly from the divine mind. A little reflection will teach the rational mind, that power primarily can only proceed from the self-existing, self-living and self-imposing principle or being of the universe; and if there be but

one being of that character, all power must primarily proceed from that being, and that such power can only exist while it is directly or indirectly connected with such being.

To illustrate this principle, I must be permitted to make use of a very humble figure. We visit a large manufacturing establishment and listen to the humming of the machinery. In one room we see the wool scoured and cleaned; in another we see it manufactured into rolls suitable for spinning; in another we see the working of the spindles converting the wool to yarn, in another the yarn is manufactured into cloth, and so on. In passing from room to room we have seen everything in motion; but in each room we have seen different machines evincing different designs, producing different motions, and apparently operating for different purposes; but when we view the whole establishment as a unit, we then perceive that every department is laboring to accomplish one grand unitary result, and that every department has been wisely constructed for that purpose. We also can begin in any department thereof, and trace the connection of the machinery with the one great moving power which propels the whole, and we shall find that all departments in the establishment must be directly or indirectly connected with its primary motive power. If by any means the machinery or any part thereof becomes disconnected with the primary power, it will cease to move, and will thus fail to perform its office; and if one part fails, that of itself will derange the whole, and the grand unitary end will not be produced.

The point here to be noticed is the necessity of keeping up a constant connection between all parts of the machinery and the primary power. The machinery, however perfect, can not propel itself, nor can any isolated part thereof propel itself. One part may be so connected with another as to be directly propelled by such other part, but indirectly and primarily it is propelled by the grand motive power.

The different parts of the machinery must not only be connected with the primary motive power, but they must be in a condition negative or receptive of such influence, so that when the power is applied they will yield thereto; and the power thus applied must be positive and active to all the parts of the ma-

achinery. In tracing down the chain of connection between the primary wheel and the most remote parts of the machinery, each intermediate part connecting the first with the last, becomes relatively positive to all parts more remote than itself, and negative to all parts more nearly connected with the primary power than itself; but the activity of all the parts depends upon keeping up a constant connection with the primary power.

Thus it is with the universe of matter and of mind. All activity primarily proceeds from the self-same fountain of all life and activity, which is the Divine of the universe. That alone is the positive of all being and power; that alone is self-living and self-impelling, and all other parts of the universe must be constantly connected with the Divine thereof, in order to derive their life and activity therefrom. Let that connection be broken, and there would cease to be any manifestation of life and power.

The material universe in and of itself possesses no inherent life and power. In its nature it is the absolute negative of all life and power. It is the very opposite of the self-living and self-impelling, and hence its unresisting and inert character. That principle in matter known as inertia, is a manifestation of the absolute negative of matter, that is, the absolute passivity of it in relation to the absolute positive of the self-living, the self-acting and Divine.

Matter being thus passive or negative to Spirit, is in condition perfectly receptive of external influence, that is, it possesses within itself no power to resist such influences, but must yield thereto. Thus it is that matter becomes the receptacle of conditions—the means of transmitting such conditions, and of uniting and combining them.

The first condition joining upon the inert and passive, and the most remote from the self-living and acting, is the electrical. It is through the immediate workings of this remote principle that matter is impressed physically and brought under the government of physical law. But this electrical agency has no power in virtue of its own existence, but derives all its energy through its connection with the Divine. Separate that connection, and it would become as inert and powerless as gross matter. Like a

remote part of the machinery separated from the propelling power it would cease to move, and consequently it could communicate no power to matter; but like the intermediate parts of the machinery, while connected with the primary power, it becomes the vehicle of the same to that which is more remote than itself, and thus it becomes positive to matter, and matter is thus receptive of its influence. The magnetic condition is more refined and subtle, and forms a sort of connecting link between the electrical and the next higher condition. These conditions, in their various forms and modifications, are the agencies producing all the revolutions and changes in the mineral kingdom. They are the immediate causes of what are termed elective or chemical affinity, cohesive attraction, gravitation, etc., with their attendant phenomena—repulsion.

The second condition of unconscious power and activity, is that which is known as the vital. It also derives all its energy from its connection with the Divine, and is the connecting link between matter, electricity, etc., on the negative side of existence, and conscious being on the positive side. This vital condition is necessary for the commencement of individualization, and it is connected with the absolute negative matter, through the electrical and magnetic conditions, in order that it may derive the material for the individual form from the mineral kingdom. This vital principle being less removed from the primary fountain of power than the electrical and magnetic, is positive and active in its relation to these more distant media, and they are passive and receptive in relation to it; so that the vital medium, through the agency of electricity, magnetism, etc., can lay hold of matter and arrange it in its vital structure.

The office of the vital medium is to select and arrange the proper material for building up the individual form. Its power is first manifested in the development of the vegetable kingdom, and it gives birth to a material form which contains within itself the formative principle, and thus the foundation of individuality is commenced. This principle is preparing the way for the next advance which is to introduce a conscious individuality.

The third condition approaching the self-living and self-acting

from the absolute negative, is the nervous or sensational. This condition is characterized by the introduction of a consciousness of existence into the individual form. Here is the dawn of mind or of spiritual individuality. This condition falls within the range of the last triune, and is manifested in the development of the animal kingdom. This advance attains to a distinct individuality, but not to a personality. This sensational principle is positive and superior to the vital, and controls it; and through the vital controls all the lower media and matter. But this principle also belongs not to the self-living and acting, but depends upon its connection therewith for all its life and power.

The fourth condition approaching the self-living and self-acting, is the intellectual or external spiritual. This joins upon the self-living and self-acting, and becomes directly receptive of it. This condition not only becomes a spiritual individuality, but joining upon the Divine, and being receptive of it, in conscious union, it becomes a distinct personality, containing within itself the self-living, self-impelling and Divine. This individuality becomes immortal by its relation to, and union with, the Divine.

This condition is the connecting mean between the internal and the external—between the natural and divine. It is the immediate means of divine manifestation to conscious beings. It is the immediate receptacle of divine love, wisdom and power combined, and the only means of such manifestation. It is the highest finite instrumentality of the Divine. This spiritual personality, being directly receptive of the love, wisdom and power of the Divine, is the highest positive of all negative existences, and consequently within the sphere of its receptivity and impenetrability, it can control all existence more remote from the divine than itself.

Each of these conditions, from matter to the divine, combining in man in an individualized state in regular succession, he becomes a means of potential manifestation in respect to each of these media, and as the potential manifestations in the fields of nature are carried forward through the agency of these media, man, according to his development and consequent receptivity and impenetrability, can control all these natural operations. But

the power thus exercised by man, and proceeding from him, as though it were resident in him, proceeds from man as an instrument of divine manifestation, and all the power thus exercised, primarily proceeds from the Divine of the universe.

Man has within himself this divine energy resident therein, as an impartation of the Divine Being; and according to his interior development and receptivity, conjoined with exterior development in subjection thereto, he becomes impartive of this divine energy, and thus becomes an instrument of divine manifestation in the various departments of the universe with which his individual being is connected.

Man, thus containing within his individual being individualized matter, individualized electricity and magnetism, individualized vitality, individualized nerveaura, and individualized spirit, united interiorly with the fountain of all life, activity and power, can manifest this power through each of these departments, according to the receptivity of that power through the interior spiritual development, conjoined with the impartibility through the exterior development of that department of his being which is to be used as the instrument of potential manifestation; for to be used for that purpose, it must possess the double quality of receptivity, and impartibility. Inert matter possessing entire passivity of character, is perfectly receptive of brute force, and for the same reason is perfectly impartive thereof; and the measure of its receptivity is also the measure of its impartive power. But man, being in the highest sense a compound being, and being receptive in the higher department of his nature, and impartive in the lower department thereof, to become a powerful instrument of potential manifestation, must be developed in all the departments of his being. He must be developed in the higher, or spiritual, to become receptive; and he must be developed in the lower, or physical, to become impartive. Hence the importance of properly developing all the departments of our being in their true and proper proportion. If the spiritual is disproportionately developed, this will tend to weaken and destroy the physical, and thereby weaken the power of impartibility, and eventually destroying the negative, or return current, through which indi-

vidualization is carried forward; and the Spirit in an immature state will be separated from the body. If the physical be disproportionately developed, that will tend to bring the individual under the loves of the lower nature, which will bring him into false relations, and prevent interior development, which will destroy the capacity of receptivity, and consequently he will not be able to impart that which he does not possess. In this way he will not be able to perceive the light and life of the Divine Being, and consequently he will be shut out of the joys which that light and life alone can give.

Man, to become receptive of this power, must possess the necessary development, and must come into a condition passive, which is represented by abstemiousness and inward desire. To become impartive he must be developed in that department of his being which is to be used as the instrument of impartation, and must be positive in his condition, which is represented by "Faith." Hence proceeds the power incident to faith. It has been demonstrated in ten thousand ways that the mind is positive and superior to all the lower media in the physical body. The influence which it can exert over the vital functions of the body is seen in the exercise of all the passions and emotions of the mind. It can throw the blood to the surface and distend the arteries and veins, or it can send it back to the heart with so much force as to overcome its power and thus destroy life. The tendency of those emotions which enkindle life and joy, are to send the blood to the extremities. The contrary passions tend to thrust it back upon the seat of vitality, and thus grief is said "to crush the heart." These things occur when the mind is suddenly called into intense action. This may be done by joy or sorrow—by hope or despair; it may be done by fright; it may be done by faith or strong expectation.

This power thus exercised may be as powerful, when wisely directed, to cure diseases as to induce them; it may be as powerful to save life as to destroy it. Its power to destroy life suddenly or by inducing disease, is well established, not only by the authority of all medical authors, but by the experience and observation of almost every individual. This point I will illustrate in a subsequent article on the "Philosophy of Christianity."

This power then may become resident in man. In his physical and mental constitution he is connected with every department of the universe, and with the self-living, the self-acting and divine. Therefore when in true relation to the universe and God through the various departments of his being, he can draw from every source, and thus can receive divine energy; and being properly developed in the lower departments of his being, which connect him as an instrument of manifestation with the external and physical, he also becomes impartive, and thus can work the works of God. But it must be remembered that man must be harmoniously developed in the physical, the spiritual and celestial departments of his being if he would become the highest, instrumentality of divine manifestation. Such was the character of Christ, and such was the tendency of the system he taught. His system, as taught by his precepts, and illustrated by his example, aimed at the due and proportionate development of the three natures, and in him they were unfolded in beautiful and harmonic proportions. Hence he became perfectly receptive and perfectly impartive. Being unfolded in his divine nature, he had the wisdom to direct and the love to impel. His faith was the "FAITH OF GOD"—it was knowledge. Hence, he taught the doctrine that "This kind cometh forth by prayer and fasting," and is exercised "by faith," or "through faith." Hence, said he, "He that believeth on me and keepeth my sayings, the works that I do shall he do," etc.

Thus it is that my fifth proposition is true, to wit: that Jesus taught that whosoever should believe on him and keep his sayings, could perform his works, and also that the power thus exercised by him was naturally evolved through the development of his personal being without any special or supernatural agency of God. Hence, therefore, I must conclude that Jesus Christ in his individual being was merely human, and that there is no occasion for considering him any other than a very perfectly developed human being, a redeeming model, a representative man.

DIFFERENT SPHERES OF EXISTENCE AND PERCEPTION.

THAT which can perceive existence or become conscious of it, is denominated mind. Existence can not be perceived by any effect which is not ultimated so as to interiorly fall within the interior triune of prime cause, means and effect. This point is first reached in individualized sensation in the animal kingdom.

Physical sensation can only reveal facts or physical effects. These belong to the outermost of existence, that is, they are the most exterior, and consequently they are the most multiform and mixed—the most subject to what is termed accident or distinction. As these belong to the outermost, they consequently have reference to form.

The revealments of physical sensation being confined to the exterior, and the senses being unable to perceive any existence which does not amount to a given size or density in a given space, can reveal nothing to the mind which does not fulfill these conditions; consequently the physical senses can not reveal to the mind intellectual truths; and the mind depending upon sensation and instinct alone for its existence, can not perceive intellectual truths.

For this reason the mere animal mind knows of nothing higher than mere physical facts, and such effects as flow directly from such facts. It must always base itself upon such facts, and the utmost scope of its reasoning power is to remember that such effects follow such facts. In its highest mental effort, it can never allow itself to lose sight of the physical fact upon which it bases its reasoning.

The mere animal is utterly incapable of pure intellectual exercise. It can not, in the observation of a fact, perceive the operation of a principle, and then proceed to reason upon such principle, disconnected from such fact. The mere animal is not developed to the sphere of pure intellection.

The *instinctive* principle in the animal can not be considered a mental faculty any more than the vital principle. It as unconsciously obeys a law of its nature as the needle under the influence of the magnet, and that law is as true to the end to be accomplished by it as is the perfectly balanced needle to the magnetic poll.

This instinctive principle depends not for its action upon thought or feeling. The principle which causes the new-born babe to take its mother's breast and draw its vital nourishment therefrom, is as totally destitute of thought, as that principle which causes it to inhale the atmosphere, or causes the blood to circulate through its arteries and veins. This instinct is to it, in relation to exterior things and its necessary action in reference to them, what the principle of vitality is to its vegetative system.

The instances of remarkable instinct in animals furnish no evidence of distinct individualized thought on the subject of instinctive action. When the bee is carefully shut up in a box and carried to a distance, and then let loose, it proceeds in a straight line to its hive; but it does not follow that it pursues that course as the result of observation or mental action any more than that the needle which, however turned, will point unerringly in the direction of the magnetic pole. There is as much evidence of mental action in the one case as in the other. The bee, in pursuing its course to its hive, can not be guided by observation, for it had no opportunity of making such observation.

If a pig be closely shut up in a box and carried by a circuitous route many miles from home, and then is left at liberty, it will take the shortest possible course to return. But this instinctive action of the pig indicates no exercise of the reasoning faculties; it indicates no higher action than that of the unconscious mediums of electricity, magnetism, vitality, etc., in obeying the laws of their existence, action and manifestation.

Under the laws of crystallization, the particles of matter entering into the crystal take a determinate position, and give to the crystal a peculiar and determinate form. In their arrangement they obey certain laws which act with the utmost mathematical precision, in giving to the crystal a certain number of sides, joining each other at certain fixed angles. These laws may

be denominated the instincts of the crystal; for they indicate as high a degree of intelligence in the particles of matter composing the crystal, and consequently as much conscious intelligence in the crystal in that respect, as does the action of the bee in the construction of the honeycomb indicate a conscious intelligence of the mathematical principles involved in its structure.

So also is it in the action of the vital principle, in building up and keeping in repair the vegetative system of the animal. Whence comes the apparent intelligence which fashions the chicken in the egg? If that work were to be performed by a conscious intelligence, where would be found the human intellect competent to the task? That the work proceeds from a conscious intelligence, as the first great moving cause, will hardly be denied; but that that conscious intelligence resides in the hen or the egg, will not be affirmed or believed.

This instinctive principle is not a conscious intelligent principle of the being in which it is manifested, any more than the vital principle is one of conscious intelligence in the being. It belongs to the highest order in the vital family, and joins the *living* principle to the *feeling* or *conscious* principle, and precedes the conscious intelligent principle.

This instinctive principle is manifested as the *dawning* of the *intelligent* principle, and is manifested before there is any indication of even the lowest order of mind in the being where it first appears. It is the connecting mean between the principle of vitality and sensation.

Therefore, in speaking of the scope of animal intellect, we are not to take into the account the action of this instinctive principle, for in reality it forms no part of the animal mind. These things, being understood it will not be difficult to understand the true scope of the conscious intelligence of the mere animal.

We come then to this: the lowest sphere of knowledge in the universe is that of material or physical facts. They are the ultimate workings of causes or principles, and are properly denominated the *outermost* of existence—the farthest removed from the *immutable* and *immortal*. They are the most multiform, mixed and mutable, and may properly be denominated the *accidentals* of existence.

These physical facts, as the ultimate product of the working of these principles, are in themselves an expression of these principles in that state of combination. But this expression is the innermost of the fact, and can not be perceived by that order of mind which is only constitutionally fitted to perceive the outermost of existence.

As there is this lowest sphere of knowledge in nature, there is also a sphere of mind just suited to observe it, and this is the lowest sphere of conscious existence as revealed in the development of the animal kingdom. In the order of development it is the first and lowest, and in order of capacity it occupies the same position. Occupying this low position, the being possessing it must depend largely upon instinct to determine the nature and character of its actions, because it is not invested with sufficient conscious mental power to enable it to provide for its continued existence.

As in the progress of development, it has arrived at the point of an individualized being possessing an individualized consciousness of its own existence, and of other existences, it is necessarily endowed with the power of volition or voluntary motion to arrange its relations to other existences. This power of voluntary motion, unless controlled by a more unerring principle than appertains to the judgment of this sphere of mind, would fail of accomplishing the true destiny of the animal, by leading it to neglect or disregard those things which are essential to its continued existence. Hence it is that instinct is so necessary to the mere animal that it should act upon the entire individual with the same positiveness and certainty as the principles of vitality act upon the various parts of the organism.

This instinctive principle is not manifested in the vegetable kingdom for the simple reason that it is not needed there. Individualization had not advanced far enough to beget a consciousness of existence, and consequently had not introduced volition. Therefore there was no power in the being to counteract or resist the operation of the laws of its existence. But when consciousness of existence had brought with it the power of voluntary motion, then it became indispensable that such a principle as instinct should be manifested.

And upon the same principle of adaptation, when the mind shall be more developed, to as to be better able to exercise a correct judgment, the demand for the exercise of the instinctive faculties will be diminished, and consequently there will be less instinctive manifestation in animals as they progress in the scale of mental development.

Here, then, we have the lowest sphere of knowledge in nature, and the lowest sphere of mind to perceive it. The facts of which this sphere is composed are innumerable, and are constantly subject to change or distinction in their individuality. They are the most fleeting and transient, consequently they can not furnish a basis upon which the immutable and immortal can be based. Being in themselves effects, they belong not to the sphere of causation.

As everything falling within this sphere of knowledge is subject to constant change, it follows that the facts of this sphere belong not to the *immutable* and *immortal*; and hence also it follows that the sphere of mind which can only perceive this sphere of knowledge can only maintain a conscious existence in this sphere. As it is conscious only of that which is a mutable or perishable effect, should it pass this sphere, there would be nothing of which it could be conscious. Hence the mind depending upon perishable effects for all it can know, and of which it can be conscious, when it passes that sphere, must be unconscious.

From the foregoing, we must conclude that the mind of the mere brute can not be immortal. It can only maintain its conscious existence while it is surrounded with those things of which it can be conscious, and while it possesses those means by which such existence is revealed to its consciousness.

If this be so, the brute mind can not be immortal. Then it is incapable of possessing immortal aspirations and desires. Aspiration and desire are active conditions of the mind, and the conditions of a thing can never rise higher than the thing itself. According to this view of the subject, every faculty, every desire and aspiration of the animal mind, must be confined to the sphere of perishable effects, and its highest wish must be able to be fulfilled in its present sphere of existence.

That this is so can not be doubted. The whole end and aim of animal activity is directed to the development and perfection

of its animal being—to the protection of its animal existence, and to its future existence in its offspring. It recognizes no higher destiny, and aspires to nothing more. Although it possesses the elements of mind, or rather the rudiments of the thinking and feeling principle, it does not perceive or recognize its existence as such.

All its instinctive and mental action terminates upon its present existence. It has no mental activity, looking to the development and perfection of its thinking and feeling principle, disconnected from its physical well-being. It has no schools or colleges, nor other means of mental or moral discipline, and it feels no demand for any such thing.

The mere animal mind dwells in the outmost of conscious existence, and consequently can only recognize the outmost of existence, and it must abide the fate of the outmost. As it has not a higher or more interior capacity, it can not penetrate to the higher or more interior of existence. In its mental constitution it is disengaged from the more interior of things.

The animal belonging to the outmost of conscious existence, and being the first link in the great chain of intelligence, and the least removed from the entirely passive or receptive state of being, it obeys more perfectly the higher laws of its being—that is, it offers less resistance to them than the next link in the progressive chain.

In all existence, before the point of consciousness is reached, everything quietly and passively obeys the laws of its being and action. Having no mind or will of its own, it acts only as it is acted upon. Thus it is in the planetary system. Every orb silently and passively obeys its highest impulse, and hence under the divine government they can not go astray.

This sphere of mind joining upon the inert and passive is much truer to the laws of its being and destiny than the next sphere; that is, its mental selfhood does not so much control the laws of its physical being and destiny, because its mental selfhood is not so distinct and positive as that of the next sphere of mental existence; and beside, this first sphere of mind has no desires and impulses looking beyond its physical being, as is the case with the next sphere.

Hence, as a natural consequence, we find in the animal king-

dom little or no tendency to commit excesses, resulting in injurious consequences to the health and happiness of the animal. They seek no other gratification than that which nature designed for them in fulfilling their duty to themselves, and their ultimate destiny in the great scale of progression; therefore there is nothing to tempt the animal astray.

This sphere of mind belonging to the outmost of conscious existence, and being subject to destruction in its individual existence, and its highest destiny being to develop and defend that existence, its highest impulse to action must have that scope and no more; that is, the mere animal can have no higher motive to action than what terminates upon its individual being, and consequently its highest impulse must be that of selfishness.

The boldness and determination with which the brute mother perils her own life in defense of her offspring, forms no exception to this principle. By the instinctive ties which unite the parent to its offspring, they, under the dominion of nature, become one, and the defense of offspring in the brute is an instinctive defense of self.

If the brute parent have more than one to provide for, although it will defend them all with equal zeal and hazard, yet it mourns not for what is lost or destroyed, so long as any remain as objects upon which its instinctive feeling can express itself.

The hen, with her brood of chickens, misses not her little ones so long as there is one to run at her side. When any of them are sick she watches not by them, but walks heedlessly on, and leaves them to die alone; yet had they been attacked by any visible foe in her presence, she would have exhibited the utmost concern for, and devotion to, them. With her natural weapons of defense, she would not have hesitated to have attacked the lion; but this action is instinctive, and is not purely a mental impulse.

This principle of selfishness is inseparable from this sphere of mentality. It is the only principle which could operate on the brute mind to lead it to defend its existence, and thus maintain that link in the chain of progress. From its mental constitution, it can have no idea of any other than its present existence, or of any other than its present wants, and consequently it can have no higher stimulus to action than that which leads it to protect

that existence and provide for those wants. Hence all the mentality of the brute looks to that end, and must be selfish.

My conclusion, then, is this: the first sphere of mind is just adapted to perceive the first sphere of knowledge; that is, to observe mere physical facts without perceiving anything more interior; that this sphere is not developed to the sphere of rationality, and yet can not maintain its existence without complying with such demands of its nature as reason would teach were indispensable; that to supply this lack the instinctive principle is introduced, which impels the individual to do that which its nature requires; that this instinctive principle is not an intelligent, conscious principle, but is the connecting link between the unconscious principle of vitality and the conscious principle of sensation; that it acts not upon the thought, but upon the feeling of the animal; that it was introduced to control the volitions of the animal, when it otherwise would have acted counter to its being and destiny, or would have neglected those things which were indispensable to it; and hence instinct supplies the place of reason in the animal, and disappears just in proportion as the rational faculties are developed.

The mental constitution of the mere animal being suited only for the outmost or mutable and perishable forms of existence, is not based upon the immutable and immortal, and hence can not be immortal; because, *first*, it cannot rise higher than that upon which it is based, and *second*, it possesses not the faculty of perceiving anything beyond the mutable and perishable forms of existence, and consequently can perceive nothing more interior than the *outermost* of existence; therefore, should it pass to the more interior—were such a supposition possible—it would not be able to perceive that interior, no, not even its own existence there.

Hence it is that the highest impulse to action in the animal must be that of selfishness; and this selfishness in the animal is a true and lawful impulse of the sphere to which it belongs. It is the highest measure of justice and right in that sphere, sanctioned by the principle of brute force, and hence, in this outmost of conscious existence, the animal is properly under the dominion of selfishness and force.

THE SECOND SPHERE OF KNOWLEDGE

The next sphere of knowledge is that which has reference to the *operation* of causes in their material manifestation. This sphere has reference to the *means* or *manner* by which effects are produced; and the mind in this sphere seeks to deduce the manner or means, by observing or studying their effects.

The means by which causes produce effects are discreted both from the cause and the effect, and exist independent of either; and yet in their exterior are related to both. Thus, for illustration, if we seek to anchor a ship by means of an anchor and cable, the fastness of that upon which the anchor lays hold is the cause of making fast the ship, and exists independent of the ship or its means of anchoring; also the anchor and cable exist independent of that upon which they lay hold, or of the ship to be anchored, and the ship also exists independent of anchor, cable or rock; nevertheless in the act of anchoring the ship, the rock, anchor, cable and ship are related to each other, and the effect produced is the result of that relation, and the means by which the ship is anchored to the rock must be such as can extend from the one to the other, and lay hold upon each. Although the anchor make fast to the rock, yet if the cable extend not to the ship, the ship will not be anchored by it; and though the anchor and cable be attached to the ship, yet unless they extend to and lay hold of the rock, the effect will not be produced.

Thus is it in relation to all causes, means and effects; the cause is discreted in its existence from both means and effects; means in their existence, are discreted from cause and effect, and effects, or things affected are discreted from cause and means; but yet in their exterior relations of cause, means and effect, they are connected, and become a trinity in unity.

As this second sphere of knowledge has reference to the *means* or *manner* by which causes produce their effects, and as these means are discreted from, and exterior to, cause and effect in their relation to each other, the second sphere of wisdom is a sphere of *relation*, and consequently is an exterior sphere; hence a mind developed only in this second sphere of knowledge can not

perceive the interior cause in its essential nature—can only trace it in its *exterior* manifestation.

The *means* by which primate causes produce their effects in their exterior relation are connected with cause and effect; but their connection and relation is purely exterior. Thus, taking effects as sequential causes and means, the sun is said to attract our earth, and to cause it to move in its orbit about its center once a year. If it be true that the sun produces this effect upon our earth, then is it true that the sun is exteriorly connected with our earth by a medium known by the name of the gravitating medium; that is, there is a medium extending from the sun to the earth, by means of which, and through which, that influence is exerted upon the earth. But this medium, whatever it may be, is exterior to the sun, and also to the earth, and exists independent of both; and the action of the sun upon the earth depends upon the exterior relation of the sun to the earth.

This exterior action of the sun upon the earth may be, nay is, determined by the interior nature of the sun; but the mind in the second sphere of understanding only perceives this exterior action based upon this exterior relation. The inmost or primate cause of that action the mind in the second sphere can not perceive or comprehend.

This second sphere of knowledge being in its nature exterior, as being only suited to represent causes in their *modes* or *means* of manifestation, and not in their *essential* nature, can not of itself reveal causes in their essentiality, nor can the mind developed only in this sphere perceive causes in their essentiality, but only in their relation; hence the intellectual or purely rational man can perceive only the relation of things, and can not perceive ultimates or primates.

But as this second sphere of knowledge joins upon the primate and ultimate, the gravitating point in this sphere is toward the primate and ultimate, and the mind developed in this sphere is constantly pushing its investigations after the primate cause and ultimate result. But being in itself not primate or ultimate, it is never able to attain to it; hence the intellectual or rational philosopher is always ranged within a sphere of knowledge, bounded on the one hand by cause and on the other by effect,

and never able to arrive at the primate of the one or the ultimate of the other; because all ultimates terminate in the one great invisible and incomprehensible cause.

The whole scope of rational philosophy is to trace the chain of sequential causes and effects. The mind can learn by observation to determine that such and such relation of such and such things produces such and such results; but why such results flow from such relations is to the rational philosopher utterly incomprehensible.

The whole process of reasoning consists in detailing a chain of sequences. Thus the rational philosopher, to explain the cause why the earth revolves around the sun, begins by affirming that there is a property common to matter which tends to draw material bodies together, and gives it a name which signifies to draw to or together, that is, calls it attraction. Now, says he, this force is always direct as the quantities of matter, and inverse as the square of the distances of those bodies; hence, says he, the sun and earth being material bodies, are invested with this attractive principle, and their tendency to come together is directly as the quantities of matter they contain, and inversely as the square of the distances of those bodies from each other. Now, says the rational philosopher, the sun and earth, under the sole influence of this attractive principle, would come together, were it not for another principle which counteracts this tendency. This counteracting influence is owing to the tendency of matter, when in motion, to move in a right line known as the centrifugal tendency of matter in motion. Now the earth being under the antagonistic influence of these two powers, can not obey either solely, but is compelled to move between the two; and being constantly checked in its attractive tendency by the operation of the centrifugal principle, and also being constantly checked in its centrifugal tendency by the attractive principle, it is compelled to move in a circular orbit about the sun, and thus the philosopher vainly thinks he understands the phenomenon of the earth's motion around the sun.

Now, supposing all the rational philosopher has said about the cause why the earth moves about the sun to be true, what does it all amount to in determining the real cause of this phenomena?

It is only affirming the existence of certain principles acting under certain laws, in certain external relations to each other. But what is the *interior* nature of this attractive principle, and this centrifugal principle? Why are *they* properties of matter, and how do they act in and of themselves? Have they an existence independent of those bodies through which they are manifested? or are they mere conditions of existence in these bodies? And if they are conditions of existence merely, *why* are they such conditions? Press your philosophy back to the primate why, and your rational philosopher stands confounded, blind as the mole, and speechless as the grave. Why? this second sphere of understanding has reference only to the *exterior relation* of things, and not to the inmost nature or essence.

After all, the difference between the Indian philosopher and Sir Isaac Newton, is not so great as is at first supposed. Said the Indian philosopher, "The earth turns upon its axle-tree like a wheel." But what does the axle-tree rest upon? Says the Indian, "Upon two great crotches." But upon what do your great crotches stand? Says the Indian, "They stand upon the back of two large mud-turtles." But upon what do your mud-turtles stand? The old Indian replies, "Me have not got any further."

So is it with the philosophy of Sir Isaac Newton. He could press his investigations in the sphere of exterior relation under the laws of exterior manifestations toward the first great primate, but when he arrived at the boundaries of primate cause, he was compelled to exclaim with his brother philosopher, "Me havn't got any further."

Take any subject of rational philosophy and analyze it thoroughly, and it results in the same thing. It consists merely in repeating in detail effects as sequential causes. He can select and arrange them, and detect their laws of manifestation. But all this has reference to their exterior existence, and their action in their exterior relation to each other, while their interior nature lies deeply hidden in their essential existence.

P R E S E N T I M E N T .

THE existence of this faculty can not be denied. There have been so many demonstrations of it made before the world, that he who would deny its existence to-day would prove himself to be unwarrantably ignorant or unreasonably skeptical. The faculty pertains to man as a spiritual being, and is most unquestionably the result of a high susceptibility to spiritual inspiration. We shall from time to time publish in the Monthly instances of the remarkable development and exercise of this and the other faculties of the mind. We publish the following remarkable presentiment of M. Cazotte, as found in the narrative of La Harpe, and which we copy from a work edited by the Rev. Geo. Bush, and published by Partridge & Brittan, entitled "Theory of Pneumatology." Says La Harpe:

"It seems to me as if it were but yesterday, although it happened at the beginning of the year 1788. We were dining with one of our colleagues of the academy, a man of genius and respectability. The company, which was numerous, was selected from all ranks—courtiers, judges, learned men, academicians, etc., and had done justice to the ample, and, as usual, well-furnished repast. At the dessert, Malvasier and Constantia heightened the festivity, and augmented in good society that kind of freedom which does not always keep itself within defined bounds.

"The world was at that time arrived at such a pitch, that it was permitted to say anything with the intention of exciting merriment. Chamfort had read to us some of his blasphemous and lascivious tales, and noble ladies had listened to them even

without having recourse to their fans. After this followed a whole host of sarcasms on religion. One person quoted a tirade from Pucelle; another reminded the company of that philosophical verse of Diderot's in which he says, 'Strangle the last king with the entrails of the last priest' and all clapped applause. Another stood up elevating a bumper, and exclaimed, 'Yes, gentlemen, I am just as certain that there is no God as I am certain that Homer is a fool,' and in reality he was as certain of one as of the other, for the company had just spoken of Homer and of God, and there were among the guests those who had spoken well of both the one and other.

"The conversation now became more serious. The revolution that Voltaire had effected was spoken of with admiration, and it was agreed that it was this which formed the principal basis of his fame. He had given the tone to his age; he had written in such a manner that he was read in both the antechamber and the drawing-room. One of the company related to us, with a loud laugh, that his hairdresser, while powdering him, said, 'Look, sir, although I am only a poor journeyman, yet I have no more religion than another!' It was concluded that the revolution would be completed without delay, and that superstition and fanaticism must make way for philosophy. The probable period was calculated, and which of the company would have the happiness of living during the reign of Reason. The more aged lamented that they dared not flatter themselves with the idea; the younger ones rejoiced at the probability that they would live to see it; and the academy in particular was congratulated on having prepared the great work, and for being the focus, the center and the prime mover of liberty of thought.

"A single individual had taken no part in all this pleasant conversation, and had even very gently scattered some jokes upon their noble enthusiasm. It was M. Cazotte, an amiable and original man, but who, unfortunately, was completely taken up with the reveries of those who believe in a superior enlightening. He now took up the discourse, and said in the most serious tone, 'Gentlemen, rejoice; you will all become witnesses of that great and sublime revolution which you so much desire. You

know that I apply myself a little to prophesying ; I repeat it, you will all see it.'

" 'There requires no prophetic gift for that purpose,' was the reply.

" 'True,' rejoined he ; 'but perhaps something more for what I am going to tell you. Do you know what will result from this revolution' (that is, when reason triumphs in opposition to revealed religion) ? 'what it will be to you all, as many as are now here ? what will be its immediate consequences, its undeniable and acknowledged effects ?'

" 'Let us see,' said Condorcet, putting on an air of simplicity ; 'it is not disagreeable to a philosopher to meet with a prophet.'

" 'You, M. Condorcet,' continued M. Cazotte, 'you will give up the ghost stretched out on the floor of a subterraneous prison. You will die of poison that you will have swallowed to escape the executioner—of poison, which the happiness of those times shall always compel you to carry about with you !'

" This at first excited great astonishment ; but it was soon remembered that the worthy Cazotte sometimes dreamed waking, and the company burst out into a loud laugh. ' M. Cazotte,' said one of the guests, 'the tale you relate to us is not near so amusing as your " Devil in Love" (' *Le Diable Amoureux*' is a pretty little romance written by Cazotte.) ' What devil has suggested to you the dungeon, the poison and the executioner ? What has this in common with philosophy and the reign of reason ?'

" 'This is just what I tell you,' replied Cazotte. ' In the name of philosophy, in the name of humanity, liberty and reason, will it come to pass that such will be your end ; and reason will then certainly triumph, for she will have her temples ; nay, at that period there will be no other temples in all France than the temples of reason.'

" 'Truly,' said Chamfort, with a sarcastic smile, 'you will be no priest of these temples.'

" Cazotte answered, ' I hope not ; but you, M. Chamfort, who will be one of them, and are very worthy of being so, you will open your veins by twenty-two incisions of the razor, and yet you will die only some months afterward !'

" The company looked at each other, and laughed again.

"Cazotte continued, 'You, M. Vicq. d'Azyr, will not open your veins yourself, but will afterward cause them to be opened six times in one day in an attack of the gout, in order to make the matter more sure, and you will die the same night!'

"'You, M. Nicolai, will die upon the scaffold!'

"'You, M. Bailly, on the scaffold!—'

"'You, M. Malesherbes, on the scaffold!—'

"'God be thanked!' exclaimed M. Raucher, 'it appears that M. Cazotte has only to do with the academicians—he has just made dreadful havoc among them. I, heaven be praised—'

"Cazotte interrupted him: 'You?—you will die on the scaffold also!'

"'Ha! this is a wager,' resounded from all sides; 'he has sworn to exterminate us all!'

"*Cazotte*. No, it is not I that have sworn it.

"*The Company*. Shall we be then under subjection to Turks and Tartars? and yet—'

"*Cazotte*. Nothing less. I have already told you that you will then be under the government of philosophy and reason. Those that will treat you in this manner will be all philosophers; they will be continually making use of those very expressions which you have been mouthing for the last hour; they will repeat all your maxims, and, like you, will quote the verses of Diderot and Pucelle.'

"The guests whispered into each others' ears, 'You see clearly that he has lost his reason' (for while speaking thus he continued very serious.) 'Don't you see that he is joking, and in all his jests he mixes something of the wonderful?' 'Yes,' said Chamfort, 'but I must confess his wonders are not very pleasing; they are much too gallows-like. And when shall all this take place?'

"*Cazotte*. Six years shall not pass over before all that I have told you shall be fulfilled!

"'You tell us many wonderful things'—it was this time I (Le Harpe) that spoke—'and do you say nothing of me?'

"'With respect to you,' answered Cazotte, 'a wonder will take place that will be at least quite as remarkable. You will then be a Christian!'

"A general exclamation! 'Now I am at ease,' said Chamfort; 'if we only perish when La Harpe is a Christian, we are immortal.'

"'We of the female sex,' said the Duchess de Grammont, 'are fortunate in being reckoned as nothing in revolutions. When I say as nothing, I do not intend to say that we do not interfere in them a little; but it is a generally received maxim that we, and those of our sex, are not deemed responsible on that account.'

"*Cazotte.* Your sex, ladies, will be this time no protection to you; and however little you may be desirous of interfering, you will be treated precisely as the men, and no difference will be made with respect to you.

"*The Duchess.* But what is it you are telling us, M. Cazotte? You certainly are announcing the end of the world!

"*Cazotte.* That I know not; but what I do know is that you, my lady duchess, will be drawn to the scaffold—you and many other ladies with you—upon a hurdle, with your hands bound behind you.

"*The Duchess.* I hope, however, that in that case I shall have a mourning-coach.

"*Cazotte.* No, madam! Ladies of higher rank than you will be drawn upon a hurdle, with their hands bound behind them.

"*The Duchess.* Ladies of higher rank! What, the princesses of the blood?

"*Cazotte.* Of still higher rank.

"A visible amotion now manifested itself through the whole company, and the master of the house assumed an air of displeasure. It began to be evident that the joke was carried too far.

"The Duchess de Grammont, in order to dispel the cloud, let the last reply drop, and contented herself with saying, in a most jocular tone, 'You shall see he will not even leave me the consolation of a confessor!'

"*Cazotte.* No, madam, none will be given either to you or any one else. The last sufferer to whom the favor of a confessor will be granted—(here he paused a moment.)

"*The Duchess.* Well, who will the fortunate mortal be to whom this privilege will be granted?

Cazotte. It will be the only privilege he will retain, and this will be the king of France!

"The master of the house now hastily arose from the table, and the whole company with him. He went to M. Cazotte, and said with deep emotion, 'My dear Cazotte, this lamentable joke has lasted long enough. You carry it too far, and to a degree in which you endanger yourself and the company in which you are.'

"Cazotte made no reply, and was preparing to depart, when the Duchess de Grammont, who still endeavored to prevent the matter being taken in a serious light, and labored to restore hilarity, went to him and said, 'Now, Mr. Prophet, you have told us all our fortunes, but have said nothing of your own fate.'

"He was silent, cast his eyes downward, and then said, 'Have you ever read in Josephus, madam, the history of the siege of Jerusalem?'

"*The Duchess.* Certainly; who has not read it? but do as though I had never read it.

"*Cazotte.* Well, madam, during this siege a man went seven successive days upon the walls round the town, in the sight of both the besiegers and the besieged, and cried out incessantly with a mournful voice, 'Wo to Jerusalem! wo to Jerusalem!' On the seventh day he cried, 'Wo to Jerusalem, and wo to myself also!' and in the same moment he was crushed to death by an immense stone, hurled from the enemy's engines.

"After these words, M. Cazotte made his bow and departed." Thus far La Harpe.

We quote from the editor of the Theory of Pneumatology the following:

"Here everything depends upon the whole of this narration being true or fictitious, written perhaps after its fulfillment, for it is certainly true that all those who were present at the dinner lost their lives precisely in the manner here predicted by Cazotte. The person who gave the entertainment, to whom Cazotte prophesied nothing, and who was most probably the Duke de Chaiusel, was the only one that died a natural death. The worthy and pious Cazotte was guillotined."

THE NECESSITY FOR CONTINUED INSPIRATION.

WE have heretofore taken the position, that to preserve the integrity of spiritual communications between one mind and another, something more is needed than a written or spoken language. Our position is, that all communications, no matter by whom given, become to each what each understands them to mean, and that they will be true or false according to the ideas they awaken in the mind of the receiver; that the same communication may be true to one mind and false to another; that it requires infallibility on the part of the receiver of a communication, as much as on the part of the giver thereof, to insure the infallibility of the communication.

We are happy to perceive that this idea is beginning to get possession of the minds of those who are engaged in a revision of the Bible. They begin to feel a necessity for the inspiration of the Spirit to guide and govern them in their work; and before they can be certain that they have given to the world "the pure Word of God in English," they must have some one infallibly inspired to determine that fact.

Read the following from the *Bible Union Reporter* of Feb. 1, 1856:

APPEAL FOR PRAYER.

NEW YORK, February 1, 1856.

"To all who love the pure Word of God, the American Bible Union addresses Christian salutation :

"The responsibilities of an undertaking, as difficult as it is important, weigh upon our hearts, and make us daily feel the necessity of divine aid and guidance. It is not needed that we should remind you that momentous interests are involved in the translation or revision of the Sacred Scriptures in any living language. In the case of our own mother tongue, a language spoken by the two most enterprising nations in the world, and destined, according to present probabilities, to exert a more controlling influ-

ence than any other, the importance of faithfulness and accuracy in correcting the version in common use is beyond human calculation. In exact proportion to our sense of this importance is our consciousness of inability to conduct an enterprise in the most becoming and useful manner, except so far as we are aided by the Spirit of God. Wisdom from above is needed in the most minute affairs of business, whether in the deliberative or executive departments of the Union, but above all, in the exercise of a sound discretion on the part of the Revisers. The Board has been singularly blessed in obtaining the services of scholars of known ability, and the publications already issued have secured the encomiums of men of learning in all denominations. But the work is still in progress, and the numerous and important questions that must constantly arise, involving the most delicate shades of meaning, and requiring the most careful discrimination, impress upon the Revisers themselves, as well as upon the officers and managers of the Union, a profound sense of the necessity of the Spirit's guidance. Therefore we call upon all who are accustomed to visit the throne of grace, and urge them, by their regard for Christ and his blessed word, to supplicate for the spirit of wisdom and of grace to be imparted to all who have the conduct of the revision enterprise, in order that the revelation of God's holy will may be made plain to the common reader, and that the pure ore of divine truth may shine forth in all its luster, being freed from the dross of human error and imperfection."

Now have these revisers never thought that the reader of their translation will need the same inspiration to enable him to *understand* it aright, so that *he* can be sure he has "the pure Word of God in English," that *they* need to enable them to make a true *translation*? They must see, if they reflect upon the doctrine of the article above quoted, that it is impossible to "give to the world the pure Word of God," any farther than the world becomes truly inspired to receive it. They may be ever so successful in translating the Hebrew and Greek into English, yet each reader of that English translation will have his own ideas of its spiritual meaning. Perhaps they will come to the conclusion that the truths of the second or Christian dispensation, sometimes called the second covenant, are not to be found upon tables or in parchment, but written by the finger of the Spirit upon the understandings and hearts of those who become members thereof.

Such was the doctrine of Jesus. His disciples could not understand his doctrines until the Holy Ghost, the comforter, the Spirit of truth, should give them the true illumination. Such also was the doctrine of Paul in respect to the laws of the second covenant, Heb. 8: 10, "For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord. I will put my laws into their mind (understanding,) and write them in their hearts (affections), and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people."

Since the year 1611, we of the English tongue have been taught to look for the infallible Word of God in King James' translation. But what were the characters of the men, and the circumstances under which King James' version was produced? Were they such as to warrant any one to suppose that the inspiration of "the Spirit of truth" was upon the translators? Let the following history of that transaction, as given in a sermon preached by the Rev. Alonzo Wheelock before the American Bible Union at their third anniversary, October 10, 1852, and published by their authority, answer.

"Wickliff translated the Latin Vulgate into English about 221 years before James I. ascended the throne of England. At that time European kings were under the authority and control of the Pope. That version weakened his influence, and began to undermine his power of supremacy over the English crown. About 126 years after Wickliff's Bible appeared, Henry VIII. came to the throne of England. Wickliff's Bible, notwithstanding all the opposition to it, had shed so much light during this 126 years, that Henry and his nobility perceived that the Pope's prerogative over kings was a usurpation; and they resolved to throw off the oppressive yoke. To do this it was necessary to have a church independent of Rome. Henry loved, as unconverted religionists are apt to do, a religion of mere external ceremonies and church services that require no spirituality in their performances, like those of the Romish Church in which he had been reared. He perceived, too, that the authoritative gradations of the clergy under the direction of the Crown, as they had been under the Pope, would tend to the strengthening of his throne. He therefore resolved upon the formation of a national church

independent of Rome, that would recognize the Crown of England as its head instead of the Pope. In all other respects he wished to have it conformed to the mother Church. 'Henry VIII,' says Macaulay, 'attempted to constitute an Anglican Church, differing from the Roman Catholic Church on the point of supremacy, and on that point alone. His success in this attempt was extraordinary. The force of his character, the singularly favorable situation in which he stood with respect to foreign powers, the immense wealth which the spoliation of the abbeys placed at his disposal, and the support of that class which still halted between two opinions, enabled him to bid defiance to both extreme parties; to burn as heretics those who avowed the tenets of Luther, and hang as traitors those who owned the authority of the Pope.' Vol. 1, p. 46. To sustain such a corrupt church organization it became necessary in process of time, as we shall see, to have an unfaithful translation of God's Word.

"After Henry's death the religion of the Church of England underwent some modifications, being composed of an amalgam of Romanism and Protestantism. When Elizabeth, his daughter, the immediate predecessor of James I, came to the throne, eleven years after the death of her father, she wished to adopt his policy, but it was then too late. About thirty-two years previous to her reign, the immortal Tyndal had given the English the Bible translated from the original. Revisions and revisions of that version under various names had multiplied Bibles in England during these thirty-two years, and many of its principles were already incorporated in the national church. To root out these principles from that church became an earnest and leading object with the Queen. Though unable to expel Puritanism from the kingdom, as evangelical sentiments were then denominated, yet both she and her bishops hated it with implacable hatred, did all they could to suppress it, and most bitterly persecuted those that embraced it. She and her clergy, like Henry her father, wished to conform the worship of the English Church to that of the Roman Catholic, and required a strict conformity to its mandates and idolatrous forms of worship from all her subjects. But the Puritans could conform only with those that were in accordance with the teachings of the Bible. Here

commenced a struggle urged on by ecclesiastical authority on the one side, and scriptural authority on the other, which it seems made the bishops feel the necessity of bringing out a version of the English Scriptures that would afford them more aid than Tyndal's in the mighty struggle. Hence originated what was called 'The Bishops' Bible,' to which King James ordered his translators to conform our present version.

A just appreciation of this model Bible, and the character it has given to our own, will require some knowledge of the character of its author, and of the circumstances under which it was produced. The firm, masculine, relentless and persecuting Elizabeth then swayed the scepter. A fitter companion for her in this oppressive and bloody struggle of might against right, of error against truth, perhaps never lived than Matthew Parker, Archbishop of Canterbury, the author of the Bishops' Bible, whom the Queen had placed over ecclesiastical affairs. History describes him as 'a severe churchman, of a rough and uncourtly temper, and of high and arbitrary principles both in church and state—a slave to the prerogative and the supremacy, and a bitter enemy to the Puritans, whom he persecuted to the length of his power, and beyond the limits of the law.' Neil's *His. Puritans*, vol. 1, p. 224. The Popish spirit of this prelate is seen in the suppression of what were called "The Prophesings." But few of the clergy were godly men, but held their office, like any other State appointment, for its salary. A few that were pious established in certain parts of the kingdom, through the permission of some of the lower Bishops, who were also godly men, meetings for the reading and expounding of the Scriptures, which were called 'Prophesings.' They were usually held once a fortnight. When the pious and venerable John Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich, received directions from Archbishop Parker to suppress the 'Prophesings' in his diocese, he declared, in his plea for their continuance, that they "had, and still did bring, singular benefit to the church of God, as well in the clergy as in the laity, and were necessary exercises to be continued." But Parker told the Queen that these 'Prophesings' were no better than seminaries of Puritanism; that the more averse the people were to Popery, the more they were in danger of non-conformity;

that these exercises tended to popularity, and made the people so inquisitive that they would not submit to the orders of their superiors as they ought.' Neil, vol. 1, p. 214. The supplication of the pious clergy to have these 'Prophesyings' continued, and the tears and lamentations of the people hungering for the bread of life, had no effect upon Parker, and he prevailed upon the Queen to command their immediate and absolute suppression. In some parishes the laboring people, it is said, "met together on holidays, and at other times after they had done work, to read the Scriptures." As soon as the news of this practice had reached the ears of the Archbishop's commissioners, whom he had appointed to watch and suppress every such thing, they immediately ordered the parsons of such parishes to suppress them. To these poor people this was a sore affliction, for these meetings appear to have resulted in their genuine conversion, and, like all young converts, they loved their Bibles; and as but few could read, they petitioned for the continuance of the precious meetings they had been accustomed to enjoy. In this petition they employ the following arguments: 'Hitherto,' say they, 'we have at divers times consumed and spent our holidays vainly in drinking at the alehouse, and playing at cards, dice, and other vain pastimes not meet for us and our calling and degree, for the which we have been often blamed by our parson. We thought it better, therefore, to bestow the time in soberly and godly reading the Scriptures, only for the purpose aforesaid, and no other. We do not favor or maintain any of the opinions of the Anabaptists, Puritans, Papists or Libertines, but would be glad to learn our duty toward God, our prince and magistrates, and toward our neighbors and our families, in such sorts as become good, and faithful, and obedient subjects; and it is our greatest and only desire to live, follow and perform the same accordingly, as God shall give us grace.' Neil, vol. 1, p. 217. But with such a Popish spirit as Archbishop Parker possessed, who, if he could, would have expelled the Bible from the realm, such a plea had no effect, and these Scripture gatherings were immediately arrested. He preferred that the poor laboring men of his church should be drinking ale, getting drunk, gambling, and such like, rather than to have them meet together for 'soberly and godly'

reading of the Scriptures.' 'During these times,' says Neil, 'the governors of the church expressed no concern for suppressing vice and encouraging virtue; there were no citations into the Commons for immoralities; but the bishops were every day shutting the mouths of the most learned, pious, useful and industrious preachers in the nation.' Neil, vol. 1, p. 199. In their humble petition to the Queen for relief, these silenced but godly clergymen say, 'If a godly minister omit but the least ceremony for conscience' sake, he is immediately indicted, deprived, cast into prison, and his goods wasted and destroyed; he is kept from his wife and children, and at last excommunicated.' Neil, vol. 1, p. 179. For marrying without the ring and baptizing without the cross, the Rev. Mr. Johnson, a very learned and pious clergyman, 'was shut up in close prison till he died in great poverty and want.' Neil, vol. 1, p. 207. Similar was the fate of hundreds of the most pious clergymen in the realm. Their petitions to the Queen for relief were unavailing, for she often said 'she hated the Puritans more than the Papists.' Neil, vol. 1, p. 202. She possessed a spirit similar to Archbishop Parker, whom he found a true yoke-fellow in his crusade against those who had derived their religion from the Bible. Under the advisements of such a prelate, she passed the severest edicts against all who neglected to attend worship at the national churches, or who held separate meetings. She was careful, however, to see that her edicts were not enforced upon her Papal subjects. While every Puritan assemblage or meeting for Bible reading was hunted out and stopped, she allowed five hundred places of Roman Catholic worship to be kept open for Papal non-conformity. Because the Sheriff and Recorder of London arrested, according to her edicts, some Catholic non-conformists at their places of worship, Elizabeth was so offended with them that she gave 'express command to have them committed to a prison in that city, called the Fleet.' Neil, vol. 1, p. 221. While thus partial to her Papal subjects, she declared that any who neglected to attend their own parishes, or frequent other assemblages for worship, should 'be deprived of their liberty, and after that subject to whatever farther punishment she should direct.' Neil, vol. 1, p. 160. 'Spies were sent to all suspected parishes to make observation of all those

who came not to church, and caused them to be summoned into the Commons, where they were punished at pleasure.' Neil, vol. 1, p. 208. It was difficult to infuse the same degree of persecuting energy into the lower bishops that was possessed by the Queen and her Archbishop. Hence they found it necessary to reprimand them for their remissness, and stir them up to a more faithful discharge of it. The Queen's Lord's Treasurer was sent to the Star Chamber, and 'ordered to charge the bishops with neglect for not enforcing her Majesty's proclamation (against non-conformists), and to say the Queen could not satisfy her conscience without crushing the Puritans, for she thought none of her subjects worthy of her protection that favored innovations, or that directly or indirectly countenanced the alteration of anything established in the church.' Neil, vol. 1, p. 201. Persecutions of the Puritans, indicated by such a purpose, were carried on with such relentless cruelty that it was taken up in Parliament, and a bill was brought in for their abatement. The author of that bill was seized by order of the Queen and imprisoned in the Tower, and thus the measure was crushed. Neil, vol. 1, p. 187. The same year, Strype says, one hundred clergymen were deprived of their livings, because their consciences would not allow them to subscribe to all the Popish dogmas and idolatrous ceremonies of the church. Neil, vol. 1, p. 187. Deposing the best ministers of the church for such a cause, was carried to such a length that the destitution of preachers became alarming. 'In the large and populous town of Northampton there was not one clergyman, nor had there been for some time, though the people applied to the bishop of the diocese by most humble supplication for the bread of life. In the county of Cornwall there were one hundred and forty clergymen, not one of whom was capable of preaching a sermon! In the city of London the people complained, in a petition to Parliament, that the churches of that metropolis—one-half of them at the least—were unsupplied with preaching ministers. The people of Cornwall complained that they had about ninety thousand souls and one hundred and sixty churches, the greater part of which were supplied by men guilty of the grossest sins. Some were fornicators, some adulterers, some felons, bearing the marks in their hands for the offense;

some were drunkards, some gamesters on the Sabbath-day.' Speaking of some faithful ministers 'not suffered to attend their calling,' they say, 'nor is it safe for us to go to hear them; for if our fountains be dried up, yet if we seek for the waters of life elsewhere, we are cited into the spiritual courts, reviled and threatened with excommunication.' Neil, vol. 1, pp. 239, 240. During these times the prisons of England were filled with Puritans (Ib. 166), who, for stealing away into some sequestered place to hear the Gospel preached, had been torn from their wives and children, many of them to suffer and die in foetid dungeons. Twenty-seven Anabaptists being discovered in a private house in London, where they were assembled for worship on Easter day, 1575, were arrested, tried in Saint Paul's church, and condemned to be burned. Neil, vol. 1, p. 228.

"But I must cease these historic references. Time allows me to give only a specimen of the persecutions of Elizabeth and her cruel prelate during these times. But amidst it all, the force of Bible truth was found more potent than the force of ecclesiastical and regal persecutions. Had they not feared a revolution from it, Elizabeth and Parker, like the Pope, would doubtless have expelled all Bibles from the realm. But this they dared not undertake. Although they could suppress all gatherings for reading and studying the Scriptures, and fine and imprison to the death and burn at the stake those that derived their religion from the Bible, yet the Word of the Lord grew and was multiplied. During all this reign, an earnest controversy had been carried on between the Puritans and the high church party concerning the monstrous assumptions of the hierarchy, and notwithstanding the cruel and bloody ordeal to which they were exposed, the Puritans were constantly gaining ground by their appeals to the Bible. Elizabeth's foxy prelate appears now to have hit upon the expedient of bringing out a version in English that should aid him more in the controversy than any then extant. In Strype's life of Parker it is said, 'The Archbishop took on himself the labor to contrive and set the whole work agoing, by sorting out the whole Bible into parcels, and distributing those parcels to able bishops and learned men, sending his instructions for the method they should observe. All these por-

tions being finished and sent back to the Archbishop, he was to add the last hand to them, and so to take care for printing and publishing the whole.' P. 208. Now can it be imagined that, for sectarian and controversial purposes, a man of such a bigoted, unscrupulous and persecuting spirit as Archbishop Parker, would select all his men to do the work, dictate to them the manner it should be accomplished, and then not allow it to be printed until he himself had 'added the last hand to it,' would bring forth a faithful version? Among the variations from the versions then in use, should we not expect to find such as would help him and his party, magnify the importance of the ordinances, strengthen the hierarchy, increase a reverence for ordination and a veneration for the church and the throne? It was with special reference to these characteristics of the Bishops' Bible, as we shall see, that King James ordered his translators to adopt that as the model of our commonly received version.

"Let us now consider the time and circumstances under which it was produced.

"King James I., under whose direction it was made, was a Scotchman by birth, and born heir to the thrones of both Scotland and England, should he be so fortunate as to outlive Mary his mother, the Queen of the Scots, and her cousin Elizabeth, the Queen of England. He did so, and becoming the lawful sovereign of both kingdoms, consolidated them into one. James' mother was a bigoted Catholic; and though her nation adopted Presbyterianism as the national religion, she adhered still to Romanism. While James was yet an infant, Bothwell murdered Lord Darnley, James' father, and shortly after Mary, his mother, married this Bothwell. The Scots believed Mary was accessory to the murder of her husband, and it produced such a state of things in Scotland, that both she and Bothwell had to flee the country. This rescued James from the influence of a Catholic mother and a Catholic education. James was King of the Scots thirty-six years before Elizabeth died, when he ascended the throne of England. During his minority in Scotland, the government was in the hands of the Earl of Murray, who was made Regent. Being a decided Presbyterian, under his administration the Scotch Parliament passed an act that the examination and

admission of ministers should be not by the civil authority, but only by the Scotch Kirk. This made the Church in part independent of the Crown, and was the basis of subsequent severe trouble. 'Both parties cherished the loftiest notions of their powers and rights, each, indeed, looking upon itself as entitled to lord it over the other.' Penny Cyclopædia, vol. 18, p. 81. A little more than six years before James ascended the English throne, things reached such a pitch, through the harangues of the clergy, as to lead to the commencement of a civil war, in which the life of the king was placed in the greatest danger. Nearly all the aristocracy, however, were with the King, and the result of the conflict was that James brought the clergy to subjection, and the substance of Episcopacy was established in the Scotch Kirk. While yet a Presbyterian, James was known to be an 'admirer of Episcopacy, and was even suspected of a strong inclination toward Popery.' Ib., vol. 18, p. 81.

"The spirit of independence which James saw in the Presbyterian clergy of Scotland, and the trouble it gave him there, had a controlling influence in determining his course in sustaining Episcopacy when he reached the English throne. From the fact, however, that he had been reared in, and was then a member of, the Scotch Presbyterian Kirk, that he had more than once spoken in high admiration of that church, and disparagingly of the English church, the Puritans flattered themselves that they would find in him a friend and protector. But they mistook their man. Those expressions were kingscraft—they were not sincere, but made only for political effect.

"When James was on his way from Scotland to the English throne, the Puritans, the Papists and the Church of England party all made their appeals to him for protection and aid, and each sought to gain him over to its own interest. The petition of the Puritans, signed by about eight hundred, prayed for relief from the tyranny of the Bishops, and deliverance from Popish customs in the church. This appeal stirred up the ire of the church party, who made a spirited reply to it, in which they addressed arguments, considering his jealous and aspiring disposition, preeminently calculated to take with James. They 'threw an odium upon the Puritans as being for a limited monarchy,

and for subjecting the title of kings to the approbation of the people.' They then addressed to him this interrogative appeal: 'Does it become the super-eminent authority and regal person of a king to subject his sovereign power to the over-swaying and all-commanding power of a Presbytery? That his meek and humble clergy should have power to bind their king in fetters, and their prince in chains of iron; that is, to censure him, and if they see cause to proceed against him as a tyrant? They then commend the present church government as the great supporter of the Crown, and calculated to promote unlimited subjection to him.' Neil, vol. 1, p. 393. The insurrection excited against James by the Scotch clergy of the Presbyterian Church only six years before, and now the obsequiousness of the English clergy, quite confirmed him in his Episcopal predilections. Macaulay, vol. 1, p. 63, and Neil, vol. 1, p. 393, 394. Before a public announcement, however, of his conversion, to save appearances and to seem to answer the request of the petitioners, he agreed to have a conference with the Puritan and church parties at Hampton Court. In this celebrated Conference the king presided in person, and it was there the project was started of getting out a new version of the English Bible.

"The Conference lasted three days, the first of which he permitted only the Church party to be present. When seated among its bishops and dignitaries in their robes, James 'congratulated himself that he was now come into the promised land, and was not a king, as formerly, in a place where beardless boys would brave him to his face. He assured them that he had not called this assembly for any innovation, for he acknowledged the government, ecclesiastical as now it is. The reason of his consulting them by themselves, he said, was that if anything was found meet to be redressed, it might be done without their being confronted by their opponents.' Neil, vol. 1, p. 396. The ruling bishop at this time was Richard Bancroft. The second day of the Conference the Puritans were called in. In presiding in this Conference, James mingled the most exceptionable partialities of the Moderator with the most arbitrary, sovereign prerogatives of the King. 'When the king conferred with the bishops, he behaved with softness and a great regard to their character; but

when the Puritan ministers stood before him, instead of being Moderator, he took upon him the place of respondent, and bore them down with his majestic frowns and threatenings, in the midst of a numerous crowd of courtiers (all the lords of the Privy Counsel being present), while the bishops stood by and were little more than spectators of the triumph.' Neil, vol. 1, p. 395. Dr. John Reynolds was appointed to speak for the Puritans. While presenting their grievances, Bishop Bancroft 'fell upon his knees, and begged the king with great earnestness to stop the doctor's mouth, according to an ancient canon, that schismatics are not to be heard against their bishops.' Neil, vol. 1, p. 398. The king frequently interrupted the doctor, and bore down upon him with such insolence as greatly to embarrass him. 'No wonder,' say his apologists, 'that Dr. Reynolds fell below himself, being over-awed by the place and company, and arbitrary dictates of his sovereign opponent.' Neil, vol. 1, p. 403. The king's insolence and tyranny was carried to such an extent, that to argue their case further, it was seen, would be useless or worse than useless, and the doctor declined to proceed; whereupon 'rising from his chair, the king said (in his Scotch brogue), if this be all your party hath to say, I will make them conform themselves, or else I will *harrie* them out of the land, or else do worse—only hang them—that's all.' Neil, vol. 1, p. 401, 403. Bancroft, that haughty and cruel bishop, whose garments have been stained with the blood of the saints, was so delighted with James that he fell upon his knees and said, 'I protest my heart melteth for joy that Almighty God, in his singular mercy, has given us such a king as, since Christ's time, hath not been.' Neil, vol. 1, p. 401. In his speech before his first Parliament, James acknowledged the Roman Catholic Church to be his mother church, having been christened by it in his infancy; he desired a union between it and the Church of England, and proposed to meet them half way in the consummation of such a union. Neil, vol. 1, p. 407. Such were his religious tendencies. His subsequent history shows how fully they were exemplified. When James ascended the throne of England, the only version of the Scriptures allowed to be read in the churches was the Bishop's Bible. With the people, however, the Geneva version

was the most popular, and the one in general use among them. Hex. p. 93. The proposition for a new English version was made by Dr. Reynolds during the second day's session of the Hampton Court Conference. James assented to the proposition, evidently from the well-known unpopularity of the Bishops' Bible, and the great dislike he had to the Geneva version, because he thought it did not sustain sufficiently legal authority. He took care, however, to direct that his version should be conformed to the Bishop's Bible as far as the original would permit, and especially that it should retain in it 'the old ecclesiastical words,' and that words of 'divers significations' should be translated—not as philology would demand, but so as to harmonize with tradition and 'the analogie of faith'—of course, the faith of the Church of England, which was composed of an amalgam of Protestantism and Romanism. Hex., p. 102. James was a very profane and wicked man. His vulgar taste inclined him much more to the chase, where he could be associated with hunters and bloodhounds, than to a company of refined and learned men, engaged in an important literary effort upon God's Word. That work he committed to men whose bigotry and sectarianism were to him a sufficient guarantee that it would be executed agreeably to the High-church notions of himself and his bishops. Bishop Bancroft was the chief overseer of the work. *Penny Cyclopædia*, vol. 3, p. 362.

"In selecting the translators, the only Puritan chosen was Dr. Reynolds, and how little influence he would be likely to have on any point touching the prerogatives of the throne, the church or the clergy, may be easily imagined by the treatment he received in the Hampton Conference. The Doctor was not allowed to have anything to do with the revision of any book of the New Testament, but he and his company had assigned to them the prophecies, from Isaiah to Malachi. He was not to be trusted with those parts of the Bible that treat of the church, its ministry, its ordinances and its order; and in the final revision of the work he was excluded altogether. Hex. pp. 105, 109.

"The spirit of those who had the authority and control of this work is seen in the events that transpired during its progress. With one hand they set a-going the revision of the English

Scriptures, and with the other they proceed to the worrying and destroying of the saints. The revision was begun in 1604. The year previous Bishop Bancroft, who had charge and control of that revision, drew up twelve canons, declaring everything concerning the church, its ministry, its ordinances, its policy and its practice to be scriptural. To these canons every Puritan was required to subscribe under oath or be excommunicated, which (as we have seen) not only expelled them from the church but disfranchised them, exposed them to imprisonment for life, and denied them burial when dead. Neil, vol. 1, p. 418. But to these canons the Puritans could not subscribe without perjuring their consciences. The result was that the very year Bishop Bancroft and his clergy commenced the work of revision, 'about three hundred Puritan ministers were silenced or deprived, i. e., of the means of support for themselves and families, some of whom were excommunicated and cast into prison, and others forced to leave their country and livelihood, and go into banishment to preserve their consciences.' Neil, vol. 1, p. 416. The same year the Rev. Mr. Maunsel, for signing a petition to Parliament for relief from persecution, was, through Bancroft's influence, imprisoned, and Nic Fuller, an eminent lawyer, for defending him in court, was shut up in prison till he died. Neil, vol. 1, p. 419. The persecution now became so relentless and severe, that many of the most learned and pious ministers fled to the continent. Several Puritans of high standing ventured to petition James for relief from persecution, when he referred them to his Council, who, as soon as they appeared before them, cast them into prison. Neil, vol. 1, p. 406. After this James got a statute confirmed, that to petition the king for relief, as the Puritans had done, was an offense finable at discretion, and very near to treason and felony in the punishment' Neil, vol. 1, p. 417. While the unhappy Puritans were imprisoned and fined, and forced into banishment, James acknowledged that he had given strict orders to the judges not to put the laws in force against the Papists. Neil, vol. 1, p. 426. But while partiality was shown to Papal non-conformists, the Puritans were so hunted down from one end of the land to the other, that several families crossed the ocean to Virginia, and great numbers were preparing to follow them, greatly

preferring to brave the dangers of the deep in a long and tedious voyage, and risk the effects of a new and untried climate, than to endure the dreadful persecutions that were being inflicted upon them at home. When Bancroft heard of this intended emigration, he prevailed upon James to issue a proclamation prohibiting it. Neil, vol. 1, p. 438. Things had reached such a state the year before King James' version was issued from the press, that Parliament interfered, and complained to the king of the partiality shown to Papal non-conformists, while such relentless and unendurable severity was exercised toward the Puritans, and seeing they were resolved upon its abatement, to prevent them from acting upon any such measures, Archbishop Bancroft advised James to dissolve the Parliament, and get along hereafter without them. He did so before they had passed a single act, and thus thwarted their benevolent designs. Neil, vol. 1, pp. 442-447.

"In view of these facts, let me ask if the care and pains-taking bestowed upon King James' version, under such circumstances, warrants its accuracy?

"Such were the times, such the men, and such the circumstances under which King James' version was produced—times which, in comparison with those in which we live, were *infernal*, and the times in which we live, in comparison with those in which that version was produced, are *heavenly*. So, too, the God-fearing men that now control and direct the work of getting out the proposed corrected version, in comparison with the persecuting, bloody men that controlled and directed the work of bringing out King James' version, are *angelic*. Both that version and the Bishops' to which it was to be conformed, came forth from a church which, during the very time of their production, was red with the fresh-spilt blood of martyred saints! Now, can it be supposed that God's Word could pass through such a slime-pit of moral corruption and come out pure? Suppose you this version would have been acceptable to James and his persecuting clergy, unless it had been so translated as to favor their high pretensions, and conceal from the mere English reader the inspired truth of the original concerning their monstrous assumptions? A long and earnest controversy had been carried on between the

Church party and the Puritans concerning several ecclesiastical questions, among which were—the Scriptural authority for diocesan bishops, and the right of congregations to elect their own pastors. Through these controversies, much light had been shed on these and kindred subjects, and the errors of former versions affecting them had been opposed. But in making out this version, King James and his crafty bishops took special care to guard these errors, by prescribing for his translators certain sectarian rules which required 'the old ecclesiastical words' to be retained, and to translate words of 'diverse significations' agreeably to the 'analogie of faith.' To do this in such a manner as not to have it known to the common reader, James' translators resorted to some very exceptionable expedients. For example, to press them into the service of episcopacy, and to shut out from our version the testimony that each church or congregation of disciples had a right to choose its own pastor, several Greek words of various significations were translated *ordain*. On the other hand, to effect the same sectarian object in different passages, various translations were given to the same Greek word. For instance, the word *episcopos*, in every passage where it could be construed favorably to Episcopacy, was translated *bishop*. But in Acts 20: 29, it could not be so construed. In the seventeenth and eighteenth verses of that chapter we read, "And from Miletus he went to Ephesus, and called the *elders* of the church. And when they were come to him, Paul proceeded to give them his solemn farewell address. In this address to those 'elders,' Paul said, v. 28, 'Take heed, therefore, to all the flock over the which the Holy Spirit hath made you *episcopous*—bishops. In this instance we see that certain church officers, denominated 'elders' in the 17th verse, are in the 28th called bishops. Here, then, is inspired proof that the appellations 'elder' and 'bishop' were both applied to the same church officer, and that the said officer was the pastor of a single congregation. But with these Scripture facts exposed, how could that doctrine of Episcopacy be sustained which teaches that bishops are officers in the Christian churches above elders, that the former have jurisdiction over the latter, and that the latter must be obedient to the former with all subjection? The Puritans had long main-

tained the doctrine of the equality of ministers, and the arguments with which they had been met by their opponents were *fines, and imprisonment, and death!* If now they reveal this fact in King James' version, how in the estimation of the people could they meet the arguments of the Puritans? James' translators perceiving this difficulty, devised a plan for concealing this fact in his version. That plan was to give the word *episcopous* a different rendering in this passage from what they had given it in every other, and thus hide from the English reader the fact that bishops were here referred to. They therefore translated it 'overseers.' Take heed, therefore, of all the flock over the which the Holy Spirit hath made you 'overseers.'

"A similar game was played with the word *cheirotoneo*. The simple meaning of this word was to *elect* or *choose*, *by stretching out or lifting up the hand*. But this word in the inspired original is so connected with the ministry, that such a rendering would undermine Episcopacy, and moreover would not translate it according to the 'analogie of [the] faith' of the Church of England. In all those passages, then, where it was possible to construe the act indicated by that word as performed by the apostles or bishops, it was translated *ordain*. By this rendering they effectually concealed the testimony of the inspired original, that in the apostolic churches each congregation of disciples *elected*, by vote of hands, its own pastor; a concealment very important, if not essential to the stability of episcopacy. But with a faithful rendering of that word, we should read in Acts 14: 28, 'And when they (the disciples) had *chosen* them elders in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they (the apostles) commended them to the Lord, on whom they believed.' In the note appended to the second epistle of Timothy we should read, 'The second epistle unto Timothy elected, by vote of hands, the first bishop of the church of the Ephesians;' and in that appended to Titus, 'It was written to Titus *elected*, by vote of hands, the first bishop of the church of the Cretians.' But instead of this correct version of the word, James' translators have rendered it in all these passages *ordain*. Now if they believed this to be its true import in English, why did they not adhere uniformly to that rendering? In 2 Cor. 8: 19, the original word is found in a connection which

shows that the act indicated was performed by the church. To translate the word, then, in this passage, *ordain*, would tend to the undermining of that doctrine of Episcopacy which teaches that the power of ordination is vested alone in the hands of bishops. But here it is said expressly to be 'of the churches.' How could the inspired facts of the case be concealed from the people? Why, by resorting to the same expedient they had adopted in a similar knotty difficulty with *episkopos*—change the translation of it. Hence, instead of translating the word *ordain* in this passage, they gave it its true import by rendering it 'chosen' (of course *by vote of hands*), as that additional idea is conveyed in the original word. But if they had given this its uniform rendering, King James' version, like the inspired original, would have contained proof of the Bible doctrine long maintained by the Puritans, that each congregation of disciples have scriptural authority for choosing their own pastor. On the other hand, if they had translated it *ordain* uniformly, this passage in 2 Cor. 8: 19, would have exposed the error of that Episcopal dogma which teaches that bishops alone can ordain. To escape from both of these difficulties, James' translators fell upon an expedient prescribed by that rule which required them to translate such disputed words according 'to the analogie of faith.' By adopting this rule, his version conceals from the English reader the inspired instruction of the original concerning these questions.

"In view of such manifest corruptions of God's Word, of numerous unintentional errors which the advanced state of biblical learning has brought to light, many changes required by the progress of our language, and a multitude of errors of minor consideration, the friends of a faithful version of God's word in English have felt impelled by a sense of duty to seek for a correction of our otherwise excellent version of the Holy Scriptures. In this undertaking they are assured that they have the mind of Christ; for, says our text, 'He that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully.'"

And what was the result of that translation? Did that justify the clergy and the church in teaching that such translation was to be received as the Word of God? Let the following testi-

mony of distinguished scholars, as cited by the Rev. Archibald Maclay, D. D., in his address before the American Bible Union at its second anniversary, speak for itself:

TESTIMONY OF DISTINGUISHED SCHOLARS.

"PROF. J. D. KNOWLES, the early able editor of the *Christian Review*, but who, I trust, is now in heaven, wrote the following in 1836: 'Excellent as the English Bible is, it does not, as every scholar knows, express, in many places, the true meaning of the original text. An English reader may compare the common version with Lowth's translation of Isaiah, with Dr. Campbell's version of the Gospels, and with Prof. Stuart's version of the epistles to the Romans and to the Hebrews, and he will see how many passages are made more lucid by the improvements of modern criticism. Shall we then virtually reject all these improvements, and extinguish the additional light which has been shed on the Bible during the last two hundred years?'

"REV. JOHN L. DAGE, D.D., President of Mercer University, wrote in 1837: 'I much dislike the superstitious regard which some seem inclined to render to King James' version. If fifty-four learned men were selected who possess clear heads and honest hearts, they might find many improvements which they could make in that version without a dissenting voice.'

"PROF. H. B. HACKETT, of Newton Theological Institution, gave the following testimony in 1850: 'It is admitted that the received English version of the Scriptures is susceptible of improvement. During the more than two hundred years which have passed since it was made, our means for the explanation, both of the text and the subjects of the Bible, have been greatly increased. The original languages in which it was written have continued to occupy the attention of scholars, and are now more perfectly understood. Much light has been thrown upon the meaning of words. Many of them are seen to have been incorrectly defined, and many more to have been rendered with less precision than is now attainable. The various collateral branches of knowledge have been advanced to a more perfect state. History, geography, antiquities, the monuments and customs of the countries where the sacred writers live, and where the scenes

which they describe took place, have been investigated with untiring zeal, and have yielded, at length, results which afford advantages to the translator of the Scriptures at the present day, which no preceding age has enjoyed. It is eminently desirable that we should have in our language a translation of the Bible, conformed to the present state of critical learning.'

"REV. RICHARD FULLER, D. D., of Baltimore, Maryland, wrote the following in 1750: 'That our present English version has some defects, is admitted on all hands, and by every denomination. That the word of God ought to be purged of all defects in the translation which the people read—this is also admitted.'

"ROBERT LOWTH, D.D., for some time Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford, where he delivered a course of lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews, which 'placed him in the highest scale of eminence as a critic,' and afterward Bishop of London, where he published a translation of Isaiah, which 'is alone sufficient to transmit his name to the latest posterity,' says of King James' version: 'As to style and language, it admits of but little improvement; but in respect of the sense and the accuracy of interpretation, the improvements of which it is capable are great and numberless.'

"BENJAMIN KENNICOTT, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, of whom it has been said by a competent judge, 'Hebrew literature and sacred criticism are indebted more to him than to any other scholar of his age,' speaking of our English version, says: 'Great improvements might now be made, because the Hebrew and Greek languages have been much cultivated, and are far better understood, since the year 1600.'

"ANTHONY BLACKWALL, A.M., author of a celebrated work on 'The Sacred Classics Defended and Illustrated,' speaking of King James' version, makes the following remark: 'Innumerable instances might be given of faulty translation of the divine original. An accurate translation, proved and supported by sacred criticism, would quash and silence most of the objections of pert and profane cavilers.'

"DANIEL WATERLAND, D.D., a distinguished minister and scholar of the last century, says: 'Our last English version is undoubtedly capable of very great improvements.'

"PROF. SYMOND, D.D., whom Dr. Newcome pronounces 'a writer of real judgment and taste,' published a work in 1789, on 'The Expediency of Revising the present English Version,' in which he says: 'Whoever examines our version in present use will find that it is ambiguous and incorrect, even in matters of the highest importance.'

"ARCHBISHOP NEWCOME, D.D., in his 'Historical View of the Present English Bible Translations, and the Expediency of Revising by Authority our present Translation, and the means of executing such a Revision,' a work published at Dublin in 1792, has treated this whole subject in a judicious and able manner. In one place, after speaking of the change which our language has undergone since 1611, the date of King James' version, the numerous faults of that version, and of the additional light which has been shed on the sources of sacred learning and the science of biblical criticism, he says: 'With such an accession of helps, with light poured in from every part of the literary world, with such important principles and with the advancement of critical skill to apply them, it is natural to conclude that many mistakes and obscurities may be removed from the present version, and that the precision, beauty and emphasis of the original may be communicated to it in various places.' P. 240.

"A learned Committee, appointed by the Board of the American Bible Society to revise, or to 'collate,' as they are pleased to call it, the common English version, have recently estimated the number of errors in it, which need correction, at *twenty-four thousand*. It is but just to that Committee, however, to say that most of them were typographical errors, although they point out and correct some of a much more serious nature. Prof. C. Kendrick, D.D., of Rochester University, after revising the New Testament, stated in his preface to it, "that the work had disclosed more numerous and more glaring defects than he had before perceived or suspected." And Dr. Doddridge says in the preface to his Family Expositor, that 'the Old Testament has suffered much more than the New in our translation!'

A PLEA FOR CHRISTIANITY.

THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN.

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 174.

IN examining the system of doctrines taught by Jesus, it is important to notice the distinction which he made between the internal and the external of man—between the condition of being and the action or manifestation of that condition. The kingdom he came to establish was not of this world—a kingdom of external force or power—by means of which one man was to become the lord and master of another. He taught his disciples to “call no man master” or lord. He aimed at establishing a government *in* each individual, and *not between* individuals. In the celestial heavens the individuals are the subjects of the divine government, not through an external force, but through an internal love or delight. The government of the Divine, in its highest sense, is the self-government of the individual; and each individual being in the Divine, is in the same government. Hence the divine government, in its inmost sense, is perfect freedom, and those coming into that government are said to be “born into the glorious liberty of the sons of God.” Thus it is that the government which Jesus endeavored to establish was that of the individual—that is, self-government. But this self-government of the individual, to harmonize, must be based upon the same common principle in all, and the interests and happiness of all and each must be the same. The individual must be maintained perfect in himself, and yet united with all, in his interests and delights. This alone could be accomplished in the love of the Divine.

Said Christ, “The kingdom of heaven is within you;” “It

cometh not by observation." The disciples, in common with the Jewish nation, were looking for the establishment of a temporal kingdom among the Jews, and they were looking for the external signs of the coming of that kingdom. They supposed the government to be established was to be *between* men, and not *in* them; that one man was to rule over another, and not that man was to rule himself.

By the term "the kingdom of heaven," Jesus always had reference to the internal or Divine in man, or to the internal or Divine in the universe; and this internal or Divine in man and in the universe is one and the same Divinity; hence it is that whoever liveth in the internal or Divine in himself is in God, and God is in him. Living in the Divine in his ruling loves and delights, and acting from those ruling loves in his aspirations and desires, in his loves and actions he is one with God; the Divine of the universe is his Father, and he is the begotten son of the Divine. Thus it is that man, in his individuality, is separate from God, while in his personality he is in God and God in him.

The internal or Divine, being the source of all life and power, of all perception and thought, being in itself the only self-conscious being and the source of *all* consciousness, is, in its mode of being, discreted from the external, which is only the means or mode of internal manifestation, and does not in itself possess consciousness of being, and can only manifest it as by development it is made receptive thereof. The conscious individuality must receive its impressions of the various parts of the universe according to its development and capacity, and it can receive no more of it than by its development it is capacitated to receive. The external and real of the universe has no existence in the consciousness of the individual, until it is translated into the conscious ideal of the mind, and then its existence there must be according to its translation. The internal or Divine in the universe has no existence in the perceptions of the conscious individual, until by development it perceives the Divine; and then the Divine only exists to such individual to the extent of its perceptions.

Hence it will be perceived that the universe and God have no existence in the consciousness of man beyond the sphere of his

development; and they exist in the ideal and perception of the individual according to his development. Hence the truth of Jesus' remark, "The kingdom of heaven is within you." The kingdom of heaven can not exist to any conscious being, except as it exists within that being; the universe and God can only exist to a conscious being as they exist in him—all *without* that consciousness has no existence to it. Hence also the truth of Jesus' remark when he said, "Except a man be born again"—be born into the internal or Divine—"he can not see the kingdom of God." Unless the kingdom of Heaven be within him, and thus become a part of his conscious being, he can not perceive it. Hence also the remark, "The kingdom of Heaven cometh not by observation," that is, by external signs or causes of observation; it must come by internal perception.

Man is the book of life to be studied, and he can learn only as his lesson is recorded therein; he can learn of the wisdom and power of God only as they are manifested or manifest in his own conscious being; he can learn of the divine being and love only by their presence and perception within himself; he can learn nothing of the God without except as he perceives the God within. To his conscious being there is and can be no other God, no other universe, no other heaven and no other hell. Upon the page of his own conscious being must be recorded all that to him can ever be known; therefore if man would be wise he must study himself; he must strive to know himself, for all true wisdom is to be found in self-knowledge.

This position can not be mistaken, neither can it be controverted; for inasmuch as nothing can exist to the mind except as it exists *in* the mind, and as nothing can exist in the mind of which the mind is not receptive, that which man can know must be learned by its presence in the conscious being. The student in history can know nothing of the events of the past, except as they are impressed upon, and thus made present in, the mind. He can know nothing of the principles or causes which were concerned in the production of those events, any further than they are translated into his mental ideal.

The student of natural history must transfer all the forms,

substances and relations of the subjects of his department into his mental ideal, or he can know nothing of them. The form of the crystal, of the plant, of the animal, etc.; their nature, their use, their relation, etc., must be translated into the mental ideal and must exist in the mind, or the student can not study them.

Study is not creative. It is only directing the attention of the mind, and controlling its condition, that it may be receptive. The individual can only put himself in a condition to receive facts, truths and principles, by opening his physical senses, putting forth his intellectual powers, and unfolding his interior being under the laws of his being and relation. After thus opening the avenues to his mind and being thus made receptive, he must depend upon that reception for the existence, to him, of the facts, truths and principles of the universe.

Hence it is that the individual must look within himself, and find therein recorded that wisdom which is to light him to the Divine, that love which is to bring him into heaven and unto God; hence it is that man's own condition of being and relation must determine whether he can perceive the Divine of the Lord, and consequently whether he can dwell in the divine presence. Hence it is that unless the Lord be formed in man, the hope of glory, he can not see the kingdom of Heaven, because it is not within the scope of his perceptions. Unless he be born of the Spirit—be developed in the Divine of his being—he can not perceive the things of the Divine Spirit.

It has already been shown that the *natural* birth gives individuality of being; that without this natural birth the individual could not exist in his consciousness separate from other existences; therefore while the natural birth is necessary to give true individuality, the *spiritual* birth is necessary to give true character to that individuality. Hence the remark of Jesus, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not perceive the kingdom of God;" hence there is a natural distinction between that birth which gives *individuality* and that which gives *character*. The first birth precedes the second, and may exist without it. There may be individuality without true character; but a being can not perceive God or his divine govern-

ment, except he be possessed both of individuality and true character; hence the necessity of the birth of the water and of the Spirit—that is, of the natural and the Divine.

Let us come, then, to this idea of Jesus, and investigate his sayings in that light, and we shall find a profundity, a depth of significance which is seldom seen in the study of the mere letter. Keeping in mind the three natures in man, the physical, the external, spiritual or intellectual, and the internal spiritual uniting with the Divine in its inmost perceptions, we can perceive something of the force and beauty of that parable which Jesus uttered when he said, "The kingdom of Heaven is likened unto a little leaven which a woman took and hid in *three* measures of meal, until the whole was leavened. Now, keep in mind that "the kingdom of Heaven is within you," and this kingdom is likened unto a "little leaven." The leaven, then, represents the Divine in man therein hidden, at first undeveloped, that is not manifested. The three measures of meal represent man in his three natures, destined to be leavened—that is, to receive light and life from the Divine. Thus this parable is full of significance, when viewed from the stand-point from which Jesus uttered it, and it teaches a volume of truth when expanded to its true ideal.

This divine principle within man is that which is brought into power by the birth of the Spirit, that it may sanctify the entire individual. The forty days and nights which Jesus spent in the wilderness preparatory to the commencement of his public ministry, were devoted to the expansion and development of this divine principle, until the entire individual being was brought into subjection thereto, and thus was sanctified. The divine leaven within him, by the exercises of those forty days, leavened the whole being, and brought him into constant union and communion with the Divine; and being thus "sanctified and sent into the world," he became the *light* of the world, and his light shone in the darkness, and the darkness comprehended it not. He drew his wisdom and power from their primitive fountain; "he took the things of the Father and showed them unto man, but man could not perceive them in their spiritual and divine significance; "he came unto his own," but "his own received

him not;" that is, he brought the divine into the language of the human, he displayed the fullness of the Godhead in his doctrines and examples, and carried it into practical life, but his own received not the instruction; "but to as many as did receive him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God." Those who could perceive his instructions and obey them, were brought by such obedience into the same union with the Divine as himself, and thus become one in him in the same sense that he was one with God.

In the same light let us examine another parable. The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a grain of mustard-seed which a man sowed in his field, and it grew till it became a tree, and the fowls of the air lodged in the branches thereof. The significance of this parable is in the minuteness of the seed and in the proportionate results flowing from its development and unfolding. So the divine principle in man—the kingdom of Heaven within him—in its first inception therein, is small, hardly perceptible, until it is developed and brought into ruling power through the birth of the Spirit; then it becomes a great tree, affording shelter and protection. And yet the magnitude of this result flowed from the vital germ in this minute seed; but such result would not have attended the sowing of that seed, had it not fallen on a soil suited to its proper development.

Again, the kingdom of Heaven is like unto a treasure hidden in a field, which, when a man hath found, he goeth and selleth all he hath, and purchaseth that field; that is, he maketh every thing which he possesses contribute to the obtaining of that treasure. The kingdom of Heaven here spoken of is in man, but under the prevailing influence of his external nature he does not perceive it. It is hidden from his perceptions in the field of his exterior perception and action. But when he does truly perceive this treasure—when he understands and feels the light, life and joy of the divine within him, he then holds every other thought, feeling and perception in subjection to this divine principle. He selleth or parteth with every other consideration, that he may possess, enjoy and dwell in this divine light and life. No man who hath found the inward treasure would neglect the means of possessing it. He would consider no other sacrifice too

great to be made for the obtaining of it. When men, therefore, neglect or despise the things of the internal or Divine, it furnishes evidence that they do not perceive, that is, have not found this divine treasure.

Of the same purport is also this parable, "The kingdom of heaven is like to a merchant seeking goodly pearls, who, when he had found one pearl of great price, went and sold all that he had and bought it." It is important to notice the different points of observation from which these parables present the kingdom of Heaven. Some of them present the kingdom of Heaven in its state of being or condition in man; some present it in its relation to the external nature, or to the kingdom of the world; some present it in its action in subduing and controlling the external nature; some present it in relation to the agencies by which it is developed or unfolded in man; that is, some of the parables present the kingdom of Heaven in its condition of being, some in its relation, and some in its action or manifestation, but in every parable, the meaning of the term "kingdom of Heaven" has reference to the divine principle in man, and is that which Jesus affirmed to be within him.

"The kingdom of Heaven," in its action on man, is likened unto a "net cast into the sea," gathering or bringing into view the entire nature of man in its being and relation, enabling him to distinguish between the good and the bad, the right and the wrong, and inducing him to cleave to the good and reject the bad, to obey the right and refuse the wrong.

"The kingdom of Heaven," in its results on the happiness of man, is likened to a householder who went forth to hire laborers into his vineyard, and he hired some at the sixth, some at the ninth, and some at the eleventh hour of the day, and at last rewarded every man with his penny, without respect to the length of time he had labored. This parable is perhaps as full of significance as any other which Jesus uttered. The reward of happiness which man receives from being in divine harmony depends not upon the question of merit, but upon that of receptivity. This happiness is an incident of divine harmony, and is experienced by all who come into the vineyard and labor, no matter at what hour they arrive. No man can come under the

ruling loves of the Divine without receiving, to the extent of his capacity, the reward of true happiness, and his penny will be to him as valuable as those who are capable of receiving more. His cup, however small, will be full, and the largest can be no more than full. To illustrate this point, was uttered the parable of the one, two, five and ten talents. The one with two talents was as faithful in their use as the one with ten, and his cup of blessings was as full, while the one with the single talent unimproved sustained a total loss. For unto him that hath shall be given—that is, unto him that hath this state or condition receptive, shall be given or imparted, but unto him that hath not, shall be taken away that which he thinketh he hath.

In speaking of the kingdom of Heaven in relation to the external nature, he speaks of the separation and distinction of the external being in all of its antagonistic influences. Being in themselves discordant influences in relation to the Divine, they must be separated from the Divine, and in respect thereto be destroyed. Those who perceive the kingdom of God, those who have on the wedding garment, those who sit on the right hand of God, those who enter into life eternal, are but different forms expressing the same significance.

By thus understanding the true meaning of the term "the kingdom of Heaven, as used by Christ, we can understand those doctrines which he taught as being necessary to be observed and practiced to fit a man to perceive and enjoy that kingdom. In all his instructions he aimed at bringing the man into harmony with the Divine Being. He encouraged and enjoined such exercises as would tend to bring the external into subjection to the internal or Divine; he prohibited all such activity as would naturally develop the external and repress the internal; he condemned all states or conditions of mind which would antagonize with the perfections of the divine character in its loves, affections and delights.

He found the character of man and society adverse to the Divine. In all their pursuits they were in an adverse love, the love of self, instead of the love of the neighbor and of God. In their affections they were selfish. They labored to gratify and develop their external natures, and sought to draw all their plea-

sure from that source. Their civil and social institutions were built upon that sandy and false foundation, and would be swept away. In their ideal of God and of their relations to him, they were equally in an error. They had made him, in character, such an one as themselves, and they paid homage to him as such a being. To them, God was their highest ideal of wisdom, majesty and power, purely an external being. He dwelt in their thoughts but not in their affections. In their estimation of his character, as reflected from their worship, their doctrines and their lives, their God was haughty, arrogant, jealous, proud, revengeful and selfish.

Such being their idea of God, their religious worship consisted in such forms and practices as they supposed were peculiarly gratifying to such a character, and was performed in reference to the benefits they were to derive therefrom. Their self-abasement before God was intended to gratify his vanity and pride; their songs of praise and adulation were supposed to affect the self-gratulations of God, and cause him to feel himself honored thereby; their prayers were designed to inform him of their desires, or to move him in their behalf; their sacrifices and oblations were expected to appease his anger and procure his favor.

Thus in their idea of God, his character and government, they were false; in their loves and affections they were false, and in all their efforts to harmonize with the Divine, they were only receding from that point. In their idea God was selfish; and in their effort to please him they were selfish; and hence they developed in the highest degree their selfish natures. Such were the false ideas in the minds of individuals, which Jesus had to eradicate before he could lay the foundation for teaching the truth, and the difficulties attending such a mission can not be estimated.

In the outset he was obliged to condemn their characters and practices, and thus array against himself all their prejudices, passions and selfish interests. He was obliged to denounce their false civil and social relations, and by precept and example expose their false practices. By so doing he necessarily increased their opposition and displeasure. He was compelled to condemn their religious views, and thus subject himself to the most intense religious hatred and malice. In addition to these embarrass-

ments, he had nothing to recommend himself or his system to those false views and feelings. Wealth, honor and fame, appetite, passion and lust, which engrossed the energies of the external man, he condemned.

And beside all those difficulties, he was attempting to teach a system of truths which the mere external mind could not perceive, and he was obliged to make use of their external language, which in itself had no significance when applied to these interior truths, and consequently he was constantly liable to be misinterpreted by those honestly seeking to know the truth, and as constantly to be misrepresented by those who wished to pervert the truth. In attempting to teach his disciples, who had all confidence in him, he was obliged to exclaim, "How is it that ye can not understand?"

To illustrate his meaning he resorted to figures of speech, similes, parables, etc., and thus endeavored to teach internal truths by external correspondences. But this even was a very imperfect way to teach divine truths, although it was the best way within the sphere of those to be taught.

He first endeavored to correct their false ideas of God by teaching them to think of him as a kind and protecting Father, rather than as a distant, haughty and selfish despot. He introduced the language, "Our Father," "Your heavenly Father." He did this that he might make use of the parental and filial feeling of the human heart as the natural language with which to teach the perfect and constant love which the Divine Being ever exercised toward all mankind. Through this figure of speech, he also taught the fraternal relation which we sustain to all mankind—that we all have one Father, even God.

He taught that God could only be approached as the individual became God-like in his character; that no act could be acceptable to God which was not prompted by a divine impulse; that any state or condition of mind which begot hatred, ill-will, a spirit of revenge or retaliation, was antagonistic to the divine condition, and must result in excluding such mind from a perception of the Divine; that in the like manner the impure and lustful condition of mind, the hypocritical, selfish and false, must result in an exclusion from the divine perception and presence.

Hence he taught that those feelings which prompted the individual to trifle with the feelings of a brother, calling him a fool or a silly fellow, or using any other language than that of kindness and love, endangered one's spiritual welfare. He also taught, in pursuance of the same principle, that crime, so far as it affected the criminal, consisted in the condition of mind prompting the commission of the criminal act, rather than in the act itself. Said he, "Whoever looketh on a woman with a lustful desire, is an adulterer; he is in an impure condition of mind, and one that brings him under the divine penalty for adultery. In pursuance of the same principle, said he, "If thou bring thy gift before the altar, and there remember that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first become reconciled to thy brother, then come and offer thy gift." You can derive no benefit from any offering or exercise of devotion, while the mind is in a condition adverse to the perfections of the divine character. Upon the same principle he prohibited retaliation; because the spirit which would prompt such actions was adverse to the principle of love which constituted one of the divine perfections, and without the possession of which, no man could see God.

Keeping these things in mind, we are prepared to perceive somewhat the profound depths of that divine philosophy which constitutes the system of truth as taught by Jesus. No part of his doctrines can be omitted without destroying the beauty and symmetry of the whole; for they are all based upon the perfections of the divine character. The principles upon which harmony and happiness in the celestial spheres are based, which is the principle of Divinity itself, are the principles upon which Jesus based his system, and every doctrine he taught is as true as the divine principle from which it was deduced. The very law which unites and harmonizes in the Divine all who are in the ruling love of the Divine, must antagonize with, and repell all, who are in the contrary love; hence Jesus' system could do no less than condemn every act which did not proceed from an impulse harmonizing with the perfections of the divine character. The selfish, ambitious, impure and false could not harmonize

with the Divine, and therefore could not dwell in the divine presence.

Jesus represented his mission to be to teach man the way by which he might come into this condition of divine harmony, and thus become one with God, described as a condition of atonement between man and God. In the fifteenth of Luke's history is set forth His representation of the manner in which man returns to the Divine, after having been in the opposite or adverse condition. This parable of the Prodigal Son is designed to present His view of the doctrine of the *atonement*, and is as follows: "A certain man had two sons, and the younger of them said to his father, 'Father, give me the portion of goods that falleth to me;' and he divided unto them his living; and not many days after the younger son gathered all together and took his journey into a far country, and there wasted his substance in riotous living. And when he had spent all, there arose a mighty famine in that land, and he began to be in want. And he went and joined himself to a citizen in that country, and he sent him into his fields to feed swine, and he would gladly have filled his belly with the husks which the swine did eat, and no man gave unto him. And when he came to himself he said, 'How many hired servants of my Father have bread enough and to spare, and I perish with hunger! I will arise and will go to my father, and will say unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son—make me as one of thy hired servants.' And he arose and came to his father. But when he was yet a great way off, his father saw him and had compassion, and ran and fell on his neck and kissed him. And the son said unto him, 'Father, I have sinned against heaven and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son.' But the father said to his servants, 'Bring forth the best robe and put it on him, and put a ring on his hand and shoes on his feet, and bring hither the fatted calf and kill it, and let us eat and be merry; for this my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found,' " etc.

In this representation, Jesus represents the two sons as being originally members of the same family; sustaining the same re-

lation to their father, entitled to the same inheritance, and equally subject to the affectionate regard of the parent. The one preferred to continue with the father, and enjoy the presence and protection, the love and counsel of that father; the other preferred to separate himself from that counsel and protection, and seek his fortune and happiness upon his own responsibility. Under the influence of his passions, appetites and lusts, he soon exhausted his means of support, and was reduced to extreme necessity. In this situation, his own resources gone, the world abandoned him. In his hunger he would have eaten the food of the swine, and yet no man gave unto him. They left him to perish, and cared not for him beyond his means of rewarding them. Herein is most beautifully and most truthfully set forth the selfishness of the world, and the end of those who aim at deriving substantial happiness from worldly pursuits.]

In this situation the prodigal reflects upon his condition. Every means of support is taken away; all prospect of relief is cut off. He thinks of that home he so foolishly left—of the abundance that those had who remained under the prudent care of his father. His folly and guilt rise up before him, and he feels condemned. Humbled and debased in his own judgment, he resolves to return and confess his guilt, and sue for the humblest place in his father's mansion. In this condition of mind he returns; and while he is yet a great way off, wretched, self-condemned, ragged and forlorn, his father sees him. He is not angry that he had forsaken him; he has no reproaches to cast upon him; he does not stop to question his sincerity; he has no question to ask respecting his penitence or his faith; he tells not of the great favors he had bestowed upon him; he requires not that the returning prodigal should be instructed in any catechism or creed, or should make any profession of faith; but he runs to him; he falls upon his neck and embraces him, and gives free expression to that devoted love of the parent which none but parents can know. Says he, "Rejoice with me, for this my son was dead and is alive again, was lost and is found." What more beautiful and touching representation can be given of Divinity than is contained in this simple figure? What stronger symbol could be adopted, within human comprehension, to express the

relation of God to man, than is here adopted? What higher and holier translation of that Christly language, "Our Father, who art in heaven?" This is Christ's representation of the divine atonement. Nothing is said about the claims of divine justice; nothing of the necessity of an infinite sacrifice to atone for guilt, or to appease the vengeance of an angry God. In the estimation of Christ nothing was necessary but that the wandering prodigal should return, and be willing to receive the father's blessing. That divine love which is more ready to bless than are earthly parents to give good gifts to their children, would throw no impediment in the way of the repentant soul.

This parable is Christ's own commentary upon the doctrine of the new birth—that birth of the Spirit which is essential to fit a man for the kingdom of God. When the prodigal had become disgusted with his licentious and dissipated course, and had abandoned it, and determined to enter upon a new and virtuous life, and when he commenced putting that resolution into practice, he was preparing to experience that new birth so essential to perfect salvation. On his return he was under the influence of self. His sufferings had arrested him in his false career, his hope of relief had stimulated him to seek his father's house; but when he received his father's embrace, and felt the warm breath of love upon his cheek, his soul melted within him, and a deep, holy and fervent love for that father, begotten by that father's love, kindled the fire of unfeigned sorrow and repentance, and his penitential tears extinguished the flames of remorse, and he experienced the truth of Jesus' saying, that to whom much is forgiven, the same loveth much.

Here, then, is a presentation of the system of truth taught by Jesus as essential to be believed and obeyed, to fit a man for perceiving the kingdom of God, which is summed up by Jesus as consisting in loving God supremely, and your neighbor as yourself. This no man can do until, like the repentant prodigal, he has returned from his wanderings, and under the influence of the Divine Spirit, has been born in all his ruling loves and affections, into that kingdom within his inmost soul, which in its essential nature is Divine, and when brought into power will guide him in the wisdom and love of the Divine.

CHRIST A CONDITION, NOT AN INDIVIDUAL.

"Lord, Lord, open unto us, and he shall answer, I know you not."

WHEN Jesus permitted himself to be called Lord, or drew metaphors in which his lordship or kingly office was prefigured, he most clearly referred to a condition. The higher life that he had attained unto, through his moral victories and his spiritual aspirations, placed him above his brethren, even as high as *their* conception of God. To them he *was* the Lord; and in calling himself thus, he arrogated nothing to himself; he established no claim of lordship or dominion. He placed himself at the hight of their conceived embodiment of a spiritual king, and was, what he was represented, a leader. Yet this establishment of his own sovereignty did not create for *himself* a hight. *His* Lord was not his own attainment, but his attainment became the Lord of his brethren. He was their prototype, their evangel. For himself there remained yet the Father, into nearer relations to whom he desired to bring all who came into his spiritual element. He repeatedly speaks of this his office, saying, "No man can come unto the Father but by me;" meaning that through the more elevated condition of his being, he alone had recognized the divine life, and its possibility of attainment. Many would recognize his *situation*, but not his *condition*. This they would do by his works, and would thus desire to reach their possible accomplishment; but unto such would there still be the denial of their lower condition. They had not lived his life through their faith or aspiration, their desire being merely for the *external* results, and their deeds the imperfect fruits of such selfish desire. They could not, therefore, dwell with him. To them he would be the *Lord* of human attainment and not of divine relation; and

their cry would be unto this their highest conception. The denial was of a *condition*, and not of *individuals*. His kingdom of heaven was attained only by the soul's highest advancement; his hell was the soul's degradation. The accomplishment of whatever was holy, and pure and righteous, was the admission fee to his walled city. A great gulf of impassable lusts and passions lay between. *He* had crucified them; *he* had subjected the animal unto the spiritual, and there remained unto him the *rest of victory*. His soul's desire and chief good was, then, to direct the way for the triumph of others. He knew the yoke was easy and the burden light, when once resolutely borne. The effort lay alone in the resolution. As an aspiration becomes fixed, it becomes a part of the soul's life. It is no longer a simple desire, but a fixed reality, and acts as an ever-strengthening and attractive force. Thus the aspiration only was sufficient to be heard. The cry of Lord! Lord! was the desire of the external blessings; the loaves and fishes became the golden promises. To enter into the Christ-life without having lived the deeds of that life, was the demand that had to be rejected. Again we say, it was never against *individuals*, but against conditions that Christ pronounced his edicts. His purity of purpose became his ever-ruling, actuating cause. The purpose of others was to obtain the desire, irrespective of the means. As in that age, so in all other ages. The Lord of to-day is not the Jesus of Nazareth, whose precepts were the result of internal harmony, and whose life was the natural expression of that harmony; but **HE** is a kind of Czar Nicholas, who consigns his subjects to the aristocratic mansions of paradise, and to the eternal slavery of degradation, without other than selfish design. Unto **HIM** the abject knee and servile homage are the *open sesame*; not the heart open to the light, and free to live the life of the highest instincts. The cry of Lord! Lord! unto him is of *individuals*, not of conditions. Thus he becomes the great stepping-stone to monarchy, and the abettor of despotism. The fear of wrath is his moving incentive, and the slavery of tyranny his best reward. This is the worshiped Lord of church and state that assumes the name of Christ, and prefaces this contradictory assumption with the history of the carpenter's son. The truthful statement given us of a life so

simple and beautiful as the early one of Jesus, renders impossible any connection with the arrogant Self-seeker that founds the Church and upholds its despotism. The law is certain that must produce from that life a man of sorrows, acquainted with our griefs, touched with our infirmities, this being the natural *result* of the individualized life, and not an action *upon* the life, to form the individual. The great disturbing cause that produces much of the error in the judgment of mankind is disregard of this—that *conditions* produce *causes*, not causes conditions. The soul that is born unto Christ, or has become at one with him, becomes thus, not by holy and righteous deeds; but the deeds are the natural and spontaneous expression of the condition of being. There is no reward for righteousness, because righteousness is a result that claims none. There is no punishment for sin, because sin is its own destroyer, by means of the higher life it calls unto. Let us well consider this assertion. Righteousness is *from* within, and is not *the inmost*. It is no more to be rewarded than the beautiful petals of a rose for unfolding unto perfection of life. They are the product of conditions, and in the *condition* lies the only cause of exaltation. Sin, or rather the low result of low conditions, is not less governed by the perfect working of law and order, and the punishment must be made upon the operating cause. Therefore are our jails and penitentiaries but the result of the aristocratic and exclusive arrogance of the judgment of *results* rather than of conditions, and have much the effect upon the community that the labor of the farmer has upon agricultural gain, who spends his time in separating from his gathered stores the sour and crabbed fruits, instead of digging about or engraving the trees, that they bear better fruit. Christ labored to perfect *conditions*. He besought his disciples to become at-one with him, to the end that he and the Father might abide with them. All legislation that seeks not the same end is false and hurtful; all religion that starts not from this point—that results follow causes, and seeks not to know the causes and to remove the ill effect by the harmony of established conditions, is not divine, and does no essential service.

Christ's life, showing his recognition of the union of all individuals in controlling causes, is the grandly heroic expression of

his unity with the Father. "My Father and I are one;" "Be ye one as we are one." Herein lies all the law and the gospel. Where is judgment? It is excluded. Where is denunciation? It has no more opportunity of expression. Judgment becomes recognition of conditions; denunciation, the effort to change them. Jesus could not withhold his sympathy with those who desired to enter his highest condition as *individuals*. "I have not known you," was his recognition of that which *specified the law of its condition*. He who toils to any purpose in the regeneration of the world—he whose labors bring forth fruit—must recognize this universal law. All men then become brethren; all evils are then perceived to be conquered in no way but by clearly showing their origin and removing *that*. Reformers who have not this universal sympathy with individuals, and non-sympathy with, or repulsion of, their false relations, can do little true service to humanity. The relation of the green apple to the ripe one is plain and distinct. The green apple must have sunshine, must have warm air, must feel the dew of heaven. No one condemns the fruit, only the conditions that prevented its perfect ripeness. Prune away the leaves a little, shorten the too luxuriant branches, and they need not cast forth this unperfected expression of controlling law, but learn through it the still higher law of a higher development. It matters not whether we term such expression, imperfection, sin or inharmony; its relation to perfection or the Divine is the same. The barrier between is impassable, save through the progress of relation.

We assume, then, that the only true standard for measuring relations is found in the unity of development, and we must look to those relations in every effort we make either to judge or reform the world. The day of judgment is when the soul first perceives its own false relations, and endeavors to harmonize them with the recognized true ones; for to perceive one's false relations will cause no severe judgment, unless they be found to conflict with higher ones. Then comes the balance, the measure and weight. Precisely as the gage falls will the punishment be awarded, and this is done alone by the soul's own measure. No other weights serve now. These have been fashioned through the influence of custom, habit and education, and the greater the

weight that is given by these, so much the more readily will the balance be determined, and the soul satisfied. Thus it is that men of conscience will compare their standards of right and aspiration, and through the influence of custom, habit and education, lose the severe judgment of themselves, and believe themselves to have attained unto their highest standard. Thus their cry of Lord! Lord! is sincere and through faith in themselves, but the higher life knows them not. There is no entrance to it for them. The *real* will still exclude the *ideal* goodness, and false standards or imperfect judgments will not form the condition requisite for the entrance into that higher life. How simply sublime is Jesus' explanation of this matter, in his comparison of the vine and the branches. The same life must enter into all; they must abide together; then the Father (or Christ's highest conception) would come unto them and take his abode with them. How earnest the exhortation to attain unto that oneness of life! There is no climbing up another way to this harmonic relation. Soul unto soul, life unto life, for are they not all *one in Christ*.

There seems to be but one lesson taught by this seemingly severe rejection by Jesus of those who desired to live with him, although through false relations; it is, that the aspiration must ever be in the courts of heaven or the *innermost*, and not from the external, which has not brought, and will never bring, fruits unto repentance. This aspiration is the principle of development, and can never fail of its results. As the leaf is the certain outgrowth of the life of the tree, and not an external gift unto the tree, so are the deeds of truth, righteousness, holiness and purity, the spontaneous fruits of the divine life. Without these, though the call be unto the Lord, entrance can not be found into his higher presence. "I never knew you, depart from me," will be the sure response. By their fruits shall ye know them—not their fruits have made them what they are. *All action comes from interior promptings, and not from external effort.* A deed is holy according to the sphere whence it was produced. A million legacy bequeathed to charity may be less noble than a penny offering, since one may be the expression of selfishness and a desire for renown, or a purchase money for peace from unholy and unjust acquirements; while the other is

the soul's highest effort to bestow its best gift. No measuring of deeds by their effects will serve. The legacy might save thousands from suffering, and thus do a humanitarian work; but the individual can never count on *that* passport to the kingdom of Heaven. He who sustains true relations to the world about him, who knows himself, even to his slightest actuating motive, can not fail of accomplishing his own best labor. What his hand finds to do, will he do; command nor denial neither stimulate nor retard him. His work is to do his Father's will, and *that will* is to him *the best and noblest he is capable of accomplishing*. To direct his endeavors into the highest channels is his *resignation* to that will. No supercilious pleadings for mercy, no demand for reward makes his labor servile. He is no longer a servant but one of the brethren, and does his *Father's* work. The present condition of society makes rewards and punishments the chief incentive to all action, and that deed is accounted best that is rewarded most bountifully. The true reward lies not in the external; but the condition that prompted the deed awards it. External rewards become punishments by the abject servility they produce. The punishment the miser receives is through his intensified acquisitiveness. The tyrant needs no curse but the unquenchable fire in his soul. "Make beautiful the city of Zion, adorn her palaces, magnify her splendor, for I will dwell in her, saith the Lord." "Abide in me and I in you;" "for the branch of itself can not bear fruit except it abide in the vine." "Come unto me, all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest." The soul responds to these invitations through its aspirations and instincts, and according to its standard of possible attainments. Rewards and hopes of rest are for those who know no aim but personal aggrandizement; yet is that low desire the progenitor of the higher aspiration, for through successive causes flow all these results. He who aims to-day to reach the golden city for its rest and peace, will to-morrow see its towers becoming glorious alone in the light of divine effort; its gates of sapphire will be the noble deed that radiates to the distant aspiration, and opens to a wider sphere of active life. As each one subjects his lower nature unto his higher, he becomes not only lord of himself, but is the embodiment of the Divine, and his kingdom and dominion

are one with Christ's. The princes and rulers of the earth, the leaders of fashion and wealth, are lords over the external sphere of manifestation; they also create their impassable gulf; but the harmony of divine relations is unrevealed in that sphere. The individual at-one with the Father knows no external law, but through his divine intuitions becomes lord and master. All *external* things are subject unto him, because he is governed by no external inclination or desire, but through all causes and relations the divine instincts of his soul make it his meat and drink to do the will of the Lord.

LOVE M. WHITCOMB.

PROPOSITIONS.

THERE is to be observed a distinction between the *power* which acts to produce a result, and the *law* by which it acts. The law has respect to the *manner*, while the *power* has respect to the *matter*, of action.

Hence the laws of gravitation have respect to the *manner* by which the power acts to produce the phenomena.

Hence the laws of a machine have respect to the manner by which the power is directed and applied.

Hence the laws of life and health have respect to the direction and application of the life force.

Hence the laws of mind also.

ALL progressive beings being subject to outward influences according to their fundamental condition and external relations, must possess the elements of all conditions suited to every relation necessary to the development of such being, from the lowest point of individuality to the highest perfection of character, and its highest condition must be such as to receive only from the highest influences of truth and love, and must be able to resist and overcome all lower influences.

Hence man, the immortal, beginning his development at the lowest point of conscious perception and affection, and destined to arrive at, or eternally progress toward, the highest, must possess within himself the embryonic conditions of every degree of perception and affection.

CONSEQUENCES OF GOVERNMENTAL INTERFERENCE,

WITH INDIVIDUAL SOVEREIGNTY.

I HAVE taken the positions, in a previous chapter, that every individual is absolutely sovereign within the sphere which nature designed him to occupy, and that no human authority could justly call him to an account for his conduct while he confined his activity within his sphere; that having derived all his natural rights with his existence, he is responsible to no other authority than that which gave him existence; that he is endowed with such rights as are indispensable to him to enable him to fulfill the laws of his being and pursue his own proper destiny, and with no other; that the Almighty has given him no superfluous rights; that he can not part with any and remain competent to fulfill the end of his being, consequently his natural rights are inalienable. Now such being the character and position of man, all that he asks of governments or individuals is to be let alone in the exercise of his proper rights and faculties. He can build his own fortune and control his own affairs, if governments and individuals will not obtrude their authority and power upon him. All that individuals can call upon government to do, and all that governments have a right to do, is to see to it that all are left to the free exercise of their natural rights and the free use of their individual faculties.

The moment governments attempt to regulate trade by their enactments, that moment the natural laws of trade are violated, and community is divided into two classes, the robbers and the robbed, capital and labor, wealth and poverty, which immediately commence breeding vice and crime; then spring up court-houses, jails, penitentiaries and gibbets, and a false human government

is the beginning and the end of the system. By its own false action it drives men to the commission of crime, and then attempts to cure the evil by punishing by fine, imprisonment and death. Human governments first force men into antagonistic relations, and then crush them for being found in those relations.

The interests of individuals and society demand that there should be the utmost integrity between men in their intercourse with each other; and that which tends to weaken or destroy that integrity tends to unhinge society by depraving its members. The influence of governments which meddle, or in any manner interfere with, the business transactions of men, and attempt to enforce the observance of contracts, or collect debts, or do anything of that kind, tends more to defeat the end they seek to attain than it does to accomplish it; beside, it leads the dealer to look more to the pecuniary responsibility than to the integrity of his debtor, and creates a greater demand for property security than for private integrity. Governments legitimately have nothing to do with the fulfillment of contracts or the collection of debts; those belong entirely to the sovereignty of the individual, and he is competent to take care of those matters.

There are an infinite variety of evils arising out of the practice of enforcing contracts or collecting debts by law, some of which I will notice: 1st. It gives rise to an intricate and complex system of rules, based upon artificial and false positions, called principles, full of technicality, which as often defeat as promote justice. The thousands of volumes already written upon the departments of civil law, and which are multiplying every year, will bear witness to the diffusiveness and complexity of the system. There are vastly more books already written upon the subject than any man can read in his lifetime. These artificial regulations and legal technicalities are constantly in the way of justice. They form instruments offensive and defensive in the hands of the cunning and wary, by which they can avoid the demands of justice, sacrifice integrity to principle, and yet maintain a respectable standing in society. Under these regulations it is not so difficult to know what justice demands, as to ascertain the legal course of arriving at it.

Under these regulations, it becomes necessary to create an

otherwise unnecessary profession in society, and compel the humbler members of community to submit to their management and demands, their claims for justice and right. This profession, from its position and the nature of the business it is called upon to transact, is ready to be feed to engage upon the side of justice, or injustice; and it becomes as honorable and reputable and honest in public estimation for a lawyer, by his shrewdness and adroit management, to aid his client in cheating his neighbor out of his hard earnings, and turning him and his family beggared and penniless into the streets, as it is to defend the claims of right and justice; and it is supposed that the attorney can argue positions he knows to be false, and by his sophistry and eloquence persuade courts and jurors to condemn the innocent and acquit the guilty, and yet himself be guilty of no wrong. The depraving and corrupting influence of such sentiments and practices in society can not begin to be appreciated; and it is one of the legitimate fruits of governmental meddling with mens' contracts and debts.

I must be pardoned if I digress enough in this place to speak of the profession of law, and of the estimation in which it ought to be held. Whatever may have been the original design of the profession, it is now just what it ought not to be. The attorney or lawyer holds himself out to the world to be employed upon either side of any legal question that can arise, irrespective of the right or justice of the case. It is not a question with him, whether his efforts are directed to maintain or defeat justice; to restore or take away rights; to convict the innocent or acquit the guilty. The party which first retains him secures his services, be they in favor of the right or the wrong. A delay of five minutes in his retainer might have caused him to be retained upon the other side, when he would have been controverting the very positions he now assumes, and exerting all the energy of his mind and body to maintain the falsity of that which he now affirms to be true. Thus the profession openly take a position before the world, that as lawyers they are ready to be employed by plaintiff or defendant; and being so employed, they will use their utmost ability to succeed, right or wrong.

Now, can any one doubt the impropriety and wrongfulness of

such a profession? If it is wrong to do injustice, is it not equally wrong to aid in doing it? And especially is it not wrong to aid, when without such aid the injustice would not have been done? And is not the attorney, who for a paltry fee will devise and aid in executing a plan by which a fellow-being is robbed of his just rights, as guilty of a wrong as though he had done it upon his own private responsibility, and for his own private benefit? Is not he who aids and abets, in the commission of a crime, and receives for such services a fee, as dishonest and criminal as he who acts as principal?

If it be true, that what a man *procures* to be done he does himself, how can the profession escape the censure and reprobation of all honest minds? Who is ignorant of the fact that the attorney, in the investigation of his cause and for the purpose of obtaining an undue advantage, seeks the aid of perjury, not directly, but indirectly? If he can so frame his questions as to obtain partial answers in his favor, when the whole truth would be against him, it is considered a part of his duty, as a faithful and skillful attorney, to do it, and he hesitates not to do so. If by any technical objection he can suppress a part of the truth so as to have the other part appear in a false light, he will do so, and argue his case upon the hypothesis that such falsehood is the truth. Upon cross-examination, where a timid and truthful witness has told an unvarnished tale, and he can not doubt the truth of it, he will nevertheless take advantage of that timidity and bashfulness, and by ingenious and rapid questions, requiring categorical and technical answers, confuse and confound the witness, causing him or her to stand self-impeached before the court, jury and world, and thus purposely convert truth to perjury and falsehood to truth, for the purpose of defeating justice, involving the character of innocence and the claims of right, for a paltry fee; and then excuse himself and be excused, upon the ground that he did it in the line of professional duty and obligation. What is the character of a profession which requires, or even excuses, such practices? What is the influence it must necessarily exert upon its members and upon the world? "A corrupt tree can not bring forth good fruit." That cause which makes it necessary to have such a profession, must be a disturbing one in the

natural order of society; and that cause is the interference of civil governments with the commercial and business transactions of men, taking notice of men's contracts and collecting their debts, etc.

But, again, the interference of government erects a false standard of morals, and tends to deprave the minds of those who would otherwise be honest in their intercourse with their fellow-men; it avoids the censure and reprobation, and preserves the reputation and standing of those who, according to the forms of law, are just, but according to the demands of justice and right, are false and dishonest. If a man seeks to avail himself of the just property of another, either by force, fraud or stealth, he is criminal, and is punished as a robber, a thief or a swindler. He is condemned in public estimation, and is punished not only by the law, but is punished by the loss of reputation and the respect of his fellow-men. He is despised, scorned and denounced, and banished from reputable society; but had he availed himself of the same advantage through the aid of legal technicalities and according to the forms of law—although it would have been equally unjust and oppressive to the poor sufferer, and although he would have been as effectively deprived of his just rights, and thereby have been reduced to absolute suffering—yet the countenance and protection of law, in whose name it was done, “sanctions and sanctifies” the whole proceeding, and the legal wrong-doer not only escapes legal punishment, but he escapes the censure and condemnation of community; his own conscience is quieted because the *law* gave him the “pound of flesh,” cut as it was “nearest his victim's heart.” In this way, men who are considered respectable, whose rank and standing are in the highest circles of respectability, are taught by this interference of law to overlook the principles of equity and the claims of justice and right, and regulate their commercial intercourse with their fellow-men by the low moral standard of legal technicalities. It is not the *wrong* itself which is condemned, but only the *manner* of doing it.

Whatever human government attempts to regulate and authorize, is thus sanctioned in public estimation. There is no practice, however immoral or unjust, however debasing and deprav-

ing in its influence, which will not attain to respectability under the sanction of human enactments. Henry Clay, in his speech in 1839, alluded to this kind of influence when he said, "Two hundred years of legislation has sanctioned and sanctified negro slaves as property;" and it is thus that this legal swindling, stealing and robbing become "sanctioned and sanctified" by governmental interference, and that is considered right which does not subject the perpetrator to legal censure. What can more effectually debase and deprave public morals? What can more effectually obliterate a distinction between right and wrong, between justice and injustice? What is better calculated to educate men to be morally dishonest and unjust? What can aim a more deadly blow at the heart of integrity and fair dealing?

The government is thus holding out constant inducements to men to avail themselves of the rules and technicalities of law to hide their moral deformities, to violate their moral obligations, and then cover their sins under the cloak of legal forms; and the inquiry, What is right, and just, and honest? has long since ceased to be made; and the other inquiry, under the law, What does the law authorize me to do or not to do—what does it excuse me from doing? has taken its place; and thus men, in their allegiance to human enactments, set at defiance the higher law of equity, justice and right, denounce their authority and despise their claims. This has arisen out of the practice of human governments attempting to interfere with the commercial relations and transactions of men, to introduce artificial rules and regulations, to supplant the law of equity and good faith by implanting the law of force in its stead.

This interference on the part of human governments has changed the true method of dealing between man and man. If no aid was expected from government in enforcing agreements between men, they would cease looking to them for that kind of assistance, and would look for security to those with whom they were dealing; but as it is, men do not expect integrity in their dealings with each other. They act upon the hypothesis that each will take all the advantage the law will give him. Their dealing is not a matter of honor and integrity, but a matter of legal liability. They deal not upon honor, but upon rules of law;

they trust not upon principles of integrity, but upon pecuniary responsibility. If their honor is forfeited or word violated, it is no more than was expected—no more than the condition bargained for, and for which provision was made by taking ample security. The debtor feels that it was not expected he was to keep his word; if it had been, his creditor would not have been so particular to guard against failure, and consequently he does not feel under so high an obligation to be punctual in his engagements. If his creditor is secure, he thinks that is all he can justly demand.

All contracts or agreements being made in reference to legal rules—being construed according to such rules, and being enforced no further than such rules will enforce them—in making, construing and enforcing them, men look not to good faith, equity and justice in their dealings, and are not expected to comply with their demands. If I can obtain your labor or property under such an agreement as the law will not recognize as a valid one, it is deemed honest and fair that I cheat you out of your honest and just dues. If by any carelessness or unskillfulness in framing our contract, our real intention is not fully expressed, by which I obtain an unfair advantage over, and perhaps can ruin you, it is expected I will take that advantage, and the law and society will sustain me in it; and I suffer nothing in my reputation as an honest business man in consequence of it. If you have, in kindness to and confidence in me, trusted me for a long time, until by the limitations of the statute your cause of action is barred, I then can avoid paying you your just demand, and yet preserve my conscience and reputation, because the law exonerates me; and thus, in ten thousand ways, the law encourages men to be dishonest by exonerating them from their obligations, without impeaching them for lack of integrity and good faith.

When a creditor goes to law with his debtor, they both take upon themselves belligerent attitudes, and every advantage, no matter how taken, is considered fair, and the parties must submit to the fortunes of war. If the debtor can ruin the creditor, or the creditor the debtor, so much the better; if the creditor can obtain a larger judgment than he is entitled to, it is his good fortune; and if the debtor can defeat the creditor, it is his good

fortune; hence integrity, justice and right are banished from their thoughts. This leads to fraudulent efforts on the part of both—the creditor to overreach his debtor, and the debtor to defeat his creditor; this leads them into a dishonest frame of mind, and prepares them to become dishonest and false in all their social and civil relations. Both become worse men, not only in respect to each other, but to society and the world. The tendency of all litigation is to depress and destroy all noble, just and generous impulses, and develop that which is low, mean, dishonest and devilish.

If the interference of government with the commercial transactions of men worked out no other evil than that of erecting a false standard of morals, and encouraging men to be unfaithful and dishonest, thereby making them worse members of society, it would do more evil than it possibly can do good, and it would furnish conclusive evidence that such interference was in antagonism with the laws of man's individual and social destiny; for it is a principle to which no exception can be found, that when an individual or community adopts a course of conduct which, if generally pursued, would bring them into antagonism with each other, and tend to make them worse men, that course involves a violation of the higher law to which all are subject, and from the operation of which there is no escape; and it is worthy of observation, that whenever governments or individuals seek to avoid evil by violating the laws of man's highest being and destiny, they generally bring upon themselves the very evil they seek to avoid. Thus they who resort to force to defend and protect themselves or to enforce their rights, often become the victims of force. This was most strikingly illustrated by the course pursued by our Puritan fathers in settling New England, contrasted with the course pursued by William Penn in settling Pennsylvania. The same is also illustrated by those who seek to protect themselves in the enjoyment of their natural and inalienable rights, by establishing a government upon principles which require the conditional surrender of those rights; and the same principle is farther illustrated by the very topic under discussion. The interference of government or law to compel men to fulfill their contracts or engagements, does more than all other

things combined to induce men to violate them ; and thus, instead of preserving good faith among men, it weakens and destroys it.

Furthermore, this interference on the part of government with the commercial transactions of men, as a whole, is incompetent to accomplish the end designed, and becomes an expensive and worse than useless piece of machinery. An experience of some eighteen years at the bar has satisfied us that the expenses of litigation, taken as a whole, far exceed the amount of debt ever collected by it. We are fully satisfied that the examination of the records and execution dockets of every court in the State and nation would verify the above statement; so that the interference of governments in matters of this kind not only corrupts and depraves men, and induces them to become faithless in the fulfillment of their obligations, but absolutely costs more than all its assistance is worth. It also breeds an innumerable quantity of offices and office-holders, and attorneys who fatten on the vices and bad faith such interference induces.

Under this system of governmental interference, the poor are often deprived of their just rights. It is true that courts are open to the poor as well as to the rich; but the expenses attending litigation are such that the poor man can not afford to avail himself of such legal means; beside, the amount in controversy, where the poor man is the prosecuting party, is usually so small, that it is eaten up by costs many times over, even if he succeeds; and he becomes a heavy loser. This fact often deters the poor man from setting up his rights, although the little is as much to him as hundreds or thousands would be to the rich; and thus he must sit down contented with his loss, which deprives him and his family of the comforts and necessities of life, or submit to a greater one by attempting to enforce his rights according to legal forms; and yet, because the law offers him a remedy at such a price as to make it impossible for him to avail himself of it, his oppressor is protected from that censure and loss of character which he would otherwise be subject to if the law did not mock the poor man with a pretended remedy.

In matters affecting the commercial relations between man and man, there should be no distinction between moral and legal obligation. All transactions between men should rest entirely upon

the integrity of the parties; and when one man is called to trust to the word or promise of another, it ought to be distinctly understood that everything depends upon integrity. If the promising party has not sufficient honor or integrity to induce him to keep his word, there is no other remedy. Under such an arrangement the most perfect integrity would be in the greatest possible demand. Every consideration of interest or selfishness would induce a man to guard well his character, and be guilty of no act which would throw the taint of suspicion upon his integrity; for integrity being his only capital, that being lost or depreciated, everything would be gone. Integrity would be an indispensable requisite to obtaining credit; property or means would not be taken into the account. The market demand for it would be so great that men would husband it well, and would not, upon trivial considerations, hazard it. It would be one of the first lessons taught to the young man fitting for business, and he would be obliged to begin early to give proof of his fidelity and integrity.

Here I will extract some pertinent remarks from the *Merchants' Ledger* as illustrating this subject. Says the editor, "I sometimes think that the habits of caution prevalent among us, the excess of documentary transactions, notes, endorsements, receipts—have rather a tendency to encourage fraud, by constantly suggesting the thought of it, and seemingly to reduce the whole thing to a game of skill. I have been confirmed in this by hearing that in places where there is less attention to these things and more trust in honor, the trust is better repaid. For instance, I am told that it is so in the West Indies and Spanish America generally. Mr. Schoolcraft, who was Indian agent at Lake Superior for twenty-five years, said that he had never known an Indian to break a promise in the way of business. I read in a recent essay on the commerce of Brazil that the slave trade, being contraband, is carried on entirely upon honor; and hence the author adds very simply, fraud is of rare occurrence. One wishes trade in general could be declared contraband if such be the result. And there is an anecdote of Mr. Fox, the British statesman: A tradesman who had often dunned him in vain for the payment of a note, came in one day and found him with two

hundred pounds before him, and claimed his share. No, said Mr. Fox; this is for a debt of honor I owe Sheridan. Then, said the tradesman, I make mine a debt of honor, and threw the note into the fire. Mr. Fox acknowledged the obligation, and paid it at once." Such, indeed, is the difference between honor and legal obligation.

Again, this interference on the part of government with the business transactions of men, makes our government vastly more complex and expensive, and imposes heavy burdens upon the people which are worse than useless. Let the government cease attempting to regulate trade, and leave it to regulate itself; let government take no notice of honest business transactions between men; leave them to be adjudicated and enforced in the court of honor, without judges, clerks, sheriffs, constables, lawyers, etc., and there would be but little for government to do. Human legislation would in a great measure cease, and men would have more time to attend to their own business, and less time to play the demagogue in the character of a party politician. Men would then cease looking to government for good or bad, easy or hard times, and would look to themselves. Instead of sacrificing honor, integrity and justice to overreach and swindle a fellow-being, they would find it more profitable to be honest, upright and just, and thus preserve to themselves a character worth more for purposes of business than all that could be gained by such dishonesty. Then self-interest would point in the direction of honesty and integrity; and thus the strongest motive power governing man in his compound nature would harmonize with his duty, and a portion of that antagonism which now prevails would cease.

But the influence in favor of honesty and integrity would be seen in the diminution of crime. Our present method of doing business is a school of crime. Men by degrees are educated to be dishonest and fraudulent in their business transactions; and under our legal system of fraud and dishonesty such transactions are not disreputable. All men excuse them, and if occasion require, practice them—the high and the low, the rich and the poor, the pious and profane. There is no conduct, however immoral, which, under the same toleration and encouragement, would not

become respectable and popular. Let gaming-houses and brothels be thus regulated by law, and let all classes of people live up to the legal license, and who can calculate the depth of depravity which would flow from that source? With integrity uprooted, and the sanctity of purity and virtue polluted, what crime would not man be qualified for committing? The sacrifice of honor and integrity incident to a life of legal honesty merely, exerts a no less baneful influence upon the general morals of society, and prepares men for becoming swindlers, thieves, robbers, gamblers, counterfeiters and murderers; and thus governments first educate men to be dishonest, tempt them to be so, and then crush them for being apt scholars and willing dupes; and do it all at their expense!

All these evils are incident to governmental interference with those things which are not within the sphere of its legitimate action; and no system of reform will ever be successful while men are involved in supporting, defending and obeying such false governments. There can be no system of ethics or morals which can more effectually deprave and destroy man, than have done all systems of human government ever yet existing upon earth; and the reason is interwoven in the very principles of our being, and can not be otherwise until human governments come into harmony with the Divine; until lower law is merged into the higher. Human governments, if they exist at all, must be based upon man's necessities as a social being, and must not antagonize with his rights as an individual; if they do, they can not fail to bring him into contact with his fellow-man. If governments assume any other function than that of protection, they will trample upon the sovereignty of the individual, and teach others to do the same.

As the sovereignty of the individual can only be invaded by force or fraud, the protection of government can only be demanded to defend the individual from the one or the other. Let, then, the government be confined to that sphere of action, and how much is there left for governments to do? What becomes of ninety-nine hundredths of human legislation? What becomes of the thousands of offices, and office-holders and office-seekers? What becomes of the popular political sectarianism

and demagogueism of the day?—than which nothing can be more corrupting in its influence upon public morals, except that system of government which breeds it. Away, then, at once and forever, with this kind of governmental interference, more to be deprecated in its influence than plague, pestilence or famine.

What do we need of government to monopolize all the land, and thus commence a system of land monopoly which robs the poor man of his right to stand or live upon God's green earth? What do we need of government to give us title-deeds to any portion of the soil which we derived from the Author of our being by a right inalienable and divine? What do we want of offices and officers to record those titles, or of human laws to define them, or of government judges to sit upon them, when every man carries his title-deed with him, as plain and easy to be understood as his title to the air he breathes or the water he drinks, or the sunlight that enlightens his path? There need be no more ambiguity about a man's title to the labor he has invested in the soil which by his toil he has reclaimed from nature, than there is about his title to any other product of his labor. Do away with the system of land monopoly and you at once dispense with land-offices and land-warrants, and deeds and mortgages. You do away with all trading and speculating in land, with all land litigation; and your land sharks no longer prowl about your graveyards to ascertain from the tombstones and newly-made graves what widows and orphans are in market to be plundered of their homes by a system of legal land piracy.

What need have we of governments to enforce contracts and collect debts, when, without such interference, only those could make contracts who had sufficient reputation for integrity to induce men to trust to their promises, and who would only be able to contract debts after demonstrating that they were possessed of a character which could be trusted. Throw men upon their own sovereignty and responsibility, and you place them upon their integrity and honor. A wanton forfeiture of one's word; a negligent or willful breach of a promise made; an exhibition of bad faith, would seldom occur; too much would be at stake to be carelessly thrown away. Property would not then take the place of integrity; means would not usurp the place of honest worth.

The honest, industrious poor man could stand alongside the rich; and while he gave evidence of integrity of character, he could obtain a credit which a wealthy profligate could not.

Let the influences which now operate to induce men to seek temporal fortunes be turned in favor of honesty and integrity of character, and the morals of society would be raised immeasurably above the present standard. Throw men, in all their business transactions, upon their integrity; teach the rising generation that their success in business must depend entirely upon their fidelity to truth and virtue; and seldom indeed will there be instances of bad faith. The reason there is so much swindling, thieving and robbing in the world, is because men carry to their ultimate the principles upon which business is legally transacted. We affirm, and will hereafter demonstrate, that the principles upon which business is transacted in the world, according to the rules of human legislation, differ not at all from thieving and robbing; and that the thief and robber, in the exercise of their vocation, do business upon the same principles that the banker, broker, merchant, lawyer, etc., do their business.

Such being the fact (and that it is so we will demonstrate beyond all cavil), is it surprising that this governmental school graduates so many villains? Our jails and penitentiaries belong to the highest department of governmental education; our criminal courts are merely boards of examination to determine what pupils have made the greatest proficiency in the principles taught by the government, and their warrants of commitment are but certificates of qualification, entitling the criminal to a seat in those governmental colleges and academies; and those institutions are usually so conducted, that when the criminal has completed his course therein, and is again admitted into society, he becomes an embodiment of governmental principles in the strictest sense. He becomes an incarnate human government; and in his abandonment and reckless disregard of his rights—of truth, virtue and morality—he furnishes one of the best types by which to study the true nature and character of human governments as at present constituted.

We do not need governments to help us accumulate property, since human governments can not create rights or privileges—

since they have no power to confer favors without robbing others of those favors they confer. We want none of their aid in this direction. We desire to have no man in society robbed of his just rights, that another may have more than belongs to him. We wish all men to possess that which is their own, until they see fit voluntarily to part with such rights. Commercial or property transactions belong to men, not to governments. If men want a currency, they are able to furnish themselves with one without the aid or sanction of government; if they desire public improvements for the purpose of facilitating trade, they need no aid from government. Capital and labor, or rather labor, must make them, whether permit be obtained from government or not; and they will be made when the business interests of community demand they should be, and they ought not to be made before. We are aware of divers objections which will be made to dispensing with governmental aid in the construction of works of internal improvement, all of which shall be answered in due time; and it will then be demonstrated that those objections are founded upon the present false state of society, and would not exist under proper social arrangements.

The influence exerted by the government becoming an operator in these works of improvement, is most corrupting and pernicious. It creates numerous offices, and consequently officers, who come into possession of influence and power, which is not unfrequently used for selfish and base purposes. A system of legal swindling and plundering is carried on to an extent unsuspected by the dear people. Again, the burdens of constructing these works fall unequally and unjustly upon the people. Those who derive the entire benefit of such improvements are taxed no more than those not benefited at all, or even those who are injured by them; beside, a trading or speculating government becomes more mercenary and corrupt in proportion as it engages in such works. The enormous debt now hanging upon Ohio and several other States in the Union, ought to be a warning to governments not to engage in such undertakings. All these things are foreign to the true end and aim of proper social governments. The government has no more to do in helping the farmer to get his produce to market than it has to aid him in

clearing his land, sowing and harvesting his grain, or any other kind of work he has to do. All this belongs to individual enterprise, and that is fully competent to the task.

These are some of the evils resulting from the interference of government with the commercial and property transactions of men; and I have only glanced at them, without examining them in detail, as from time to time I shall have occasion to do. Thus I have endeavored to demonstrate the falsity and oppressive character of all human governments—the false principles upon which they act, the false relation they sustain to man, and consequently the antagonistic relation they sustain to the divine government, and that these human governments are fundamentally and radically wrong, and can not be made available for the protection of the individual, without being changed in their entire character and relation. They originated in the principle that might makes right, and under all forms they adhere to it. The sovereignty of the individual is destroyed; and whether the power be exercised by the few or the many, it is despotic, and overrides the rights of the individual.

In the outset it assumes to be supreme and absolute over the lives, liberty and property of its subjects. It assumes the right to make legal crimes, and affix such penalties as it thinks proper for the commission of them. Its penal code calls for life, liberty or property according to the caprice of those who framed it. It assumes to be Lord of the soil, and to grant to whomsoever it sees proper, upon such terms, in such quantities as it pleases, the exclusive right to exercise dominion over it. Hence it originates, builds up and sustains a system of land monopoly which is one of the primary causes of dividing society into two classes, the rich and the poor, the robbers and the robbed; it then takes the part of the rich and legislates for their benefit—protects them in their usurpations and oppressions. It grants them privileges which it denies to the poor man, and by its policy enables them to increase their wealth by plundering the poor laborer of his hard earnings. It holds out immunity to the legal robber, and swindler, and murderer, and places its own mandates above the claims of justice and right; it encourages men to be dishonest, false and unjust.

The moral influence of government is such that it imparts a moral leprosy to those who administer it. It has been the universal experience of man that the most immoral places and corrupt places on earth are those where governmental influence and power are concentrated. Gaming, intemperance and debauchery flourish in the highest degree at the seat of all human governments; honor, integrity, sobriety and virtue are hardly known within their blighting influence. The reason is, there is not a principle of justice, righteousness or virtue which all human governments do not set at defiance; and as these governments are administered by men, or rather are the administration of men, they only reflect the character of those who administer them; and whoever comes into their society, and becomes a partaker of their deeds, is soon infected by their influence; and unless he has true principles and courage and firmness to assert and maintain them, he will soon sink into their foul embrace, and become as putrid and corrupt as the rest of them.

Man, by nature, is invested with certain rights. He has a sphere within which he is sovereign and absolute, relatively. He has dominion only over himself and such portions of nature as fall within his sphere. He was not designed to have dominion only within his sphere, consequently nature fitted him only for for such dominion—not for dominion over others as sovereign as himself. Hence he is not qualified for dominion over others. The moment he attempts such dominion, he has overstepped the limits of his sphere, and has undertaken a work he is incompetent to perform aright; consequently men can not be trusted with the power of dominion over others. They will inevitably abuse it, and become oppressive; for a man that is willing to exercise such dominion can not be trusted with such power; and the man who is not willing to exercise it will not accept of such power. The very willingness to exercise such power is proof positive of an unfitness for it.

We come back, then, to our original proposition, That man has an absolute and sovereign right to the free use of all his faculties and powers, and that within his sphere he is responsible to no human authority; and no government or society will harmonize with the nature and necessities of man, which does not preserve

the individuality and sovereignty of each member thereof. This interference of government with the sovereignty of the individual, is the most fruitful source of all the vices and crimes which now afflict and desolate the world, all of which will be fully demonstrated in due time.

PROPOSITIONS.

THE specific laws of potential manifestation are according to condition and relation of cause, means and end, and the law of manifestation and action will vary according as condition and relation vary.

Hence if any specific result be to be accomplished, a specific condition and relation must be assumed, that the law may be manifested in working such result; and the condition and relation may be simple or compound, but they must be such as to ultimate the simple condition and relation necessary.

Hence, although there are many ways of constructing and arranging machinery to accomplish the same end, yet when constructed and arranged so as to produce the same result, they all ultimate into the simple condition and relation.

THAT which belongs to the immortal, and which is needed for the development of the true spiritual individuality, can not be appropriated to the exclusion of any other spiritual individuality, because it is not subject to the conditions of time and space.

Hence the impulses belonging to the true spiritual individuality, and which lead to the highest destiny of the Spirit, are not subject to antagonism, nor are they consistent with selfish appropriation.

Hence all impulses to selfish appropriation are antagonistic, where such appropriation must be to the exclusion of the just rights and needs of others.

Hence such a desire begets antagonism in the true spiritual individuality.

THE SECOND SPHERE OF KNOWLEDGE AND MIND.

THE rational principle in man, said to be the highest of the intellectual faculties, is in itself imperfect as a means of acquiring knowledge. From its constitutional nature it can not arrive at the absolute of truths or principles. In its highest expansiveness it is as far from comprehending an ultimate truth as in its lowest degree of development. The mind of a Newton could no more comprehend the essential nature of gravitation than could the mind of an idiot, while the giant intellect stood as dumb and blind as to the essential nature of any ultimate cause or principle, as it did the day it drew its first nourishment from its mother's breast. The reason why this is so is because in its constitution it is not of itself an ultimate.

This rational principle is developed in, and belongs to, the second sphere of wisdom. It is discrete in its nature, and can not grow up into the higher sphere of cause. It is but the second person in the triune of conscious existence, and can not by any possibility become the first, and it is not necessary or proper that it should. There is a sphere of truth adapted to its comprehension, and in that sphere it is proper that it should abide.

But the sphere of wisdom suited to its nature is the sphere of action and condition based upon relation, and this sphere of action and condition is exterior to the essential or ultimate cause; and although it joins upon it, it is not essentially of it, but is discrete therefrom. All that the intellectual faculties can perceive of an ultimate cause is in its manifestation in the sphere of action and relation. Although these faculties can perceive the operation of a law under which ultimate principles are manifested, yet that law of manifestation always has reference to exterior relation.

There are no means by which the intellectual faculties can arrive at an ultimate; and whenever that is attempted the intellectual philosopher is involved in an absurdity. Whatever the intellect attempts to investigate, it at once finites and renders imperfect in its intellectual conception.

Thus the intellect affirms the endless divisibility of matter, and yet it can not perceive the idea it affirms. By a system of mathematical reasoning it can demonstrate its infinite divisibility—that is, it can demonstrate that it can not perceive or express the limit of its divisibility, but yet in the finiteness of its capacity it can not find a resting-place this side of infinity, nor even reach it there.

The intellect affirms that for every effect there must be an adequate cause, and that all must at last ultimate in a great cause uncaused, yet it can fashion no idea of that inmost cause of all things. When intellect affirms that there is a great first cause, self-existent in being, spontaneous in action, omnipotent in power, omniscient in wisdom and omnipresent in being, it affirms a truth of which it can have no perception. It does not affirm it from an intellectual perception of it, but because in the finitude of its capacity it determines that there must be a beginning and an end of all sequences.

Thus also is it when the intellect affirms the existence of a God; it affirms that existence from an *exterior necessity*, and not from *interior perception* of it. The intellect can not attain to any knowledge or idea of the Divine; it is as blind as the mole and speechless as the grave when it attempts to contemplate the deific essence; it can perceive God in his *existere*, that is, in his manifestation of wisdom and power, but it can not perceive him in his *esse* or inmost nature.

Thus it will be perceived that the intellectual man can not perceive God by virtue of his intellectuality, any more than he can by his physical senses. He can only perceive the Divine Being in his exterior action or manifestation; hence intellect can learn only of the existence of Deity through his exterior manifestation of wisdom and power, but it can perceive nothing of the divine character or essence; therefore the only way the mere

intellectual man can arrive at the being of God is through an inferential necessity.

And thus it is in regard to all truths intellectually perceived. The highest scope of intellectual philosophy is to discover and explain the exterior nature and relation of existence, and not its interior essentiality; so it must be perceived that the intellectual faculties are not suited to the investigation and perception of truths in their interior essence or inmost signification. If man hopes to be instructed in celestial or divine principles, he must develop a higher being than mere intellectuality.

This intellectual principle, in order of being, joins upon the primates, and individualizes in reference to direct action proceeding from the primate. It is the exterior of the primate, and as such is based upon the immortal relation of primate to mediate. It is able to perceive the existence of the immutable and immortal in their action or manifestation, and hence can maintain a conscious existence in the sphere of causation.

This intellectual principle is a thinking rather than a feeling principle, and the intellectual being as such thinks rather than feels. To think is one thing; to feel is another. Thinking has reference to the action of the mind, feeling to the condition; thinking is exterior, feeling is more interior. Thought is action, feeling is passion.

The intellect is characterized for its lack of feeling or sympathy; it is stern, cold and unsympathetic; it has no conscience; it can perceive the exterior beauty and fitness of truth, purity and virtue, and at the same time can violate them all without compunction. It can discourse eloquently upon liberty, justice and right, while it is trampling them in the dust.

This intellectual principle is the educational principle, and the intellectual individuality is the creature of surrounding externals.

The truth of this position can not be doubted. Whatever exerts its influence upon the individual, awakening thought, forming ideas, creating images, be they true or false, becomes a part of the educational process by which the intellectuality of the individual is determined. They tend to build up the external character of the individual, that which is to connect him with

the external universe, and thus to determine the relation he is to sustain to the universe of truth or falsehood.

Hence it is that universal observation has determined that man is a creature of surrounding circumstances; that the sum of all these external influences becomes the mold in which the external character is cast; hence it is that conscience, which views external relations and judges of them in their external influence, partakes of the character of its educating circumstances.

These educational influences are seen and felt in every individual under the dominion of the external. They appear as well in the religious and political as in the civil, social and physical character of the individual. The *form* of faith is purely external in its character, and will be shaped by educational circumstances. These circumstances determine whether we shall be sprinkled with the baptismal water of a Christian ordinance, or be strangled in the muddy waters of the Ganges.

Forms of religious faith depend upon education, and hence the almost infinite variety in such forms. The religious element is to be found in all men, and that element seeks expression; but while men are under the dominion of the exterior and educational, the expression of the religious element will assume a certain form characteristic of the exterior.

All *FORMS* of existence, as well of thought as of expression, belong to the exterior, and depend more or less upon the accidental for their existence. Those forms joining immediately upon the inmost or essentiality of existence are immutable and immortal by their relation to the immutable and immortal. Sever that relation, and they must perish; but as long as that relation continues, they must continue; and as the relation of the immortal to the immutable must forever be constant, these inmost forms of thought, etc., must be immortal. Hence this second sphere of mind, which constitutes the second person in the triune of *conscious* existence, belongs to the immutable and immortal, and being in its nature exterior, that is in its existence depending upon relation, it forms the exterior of the immutable and immortal in man.

Thus it is: There is this second sphere of knowledge in nature, and there is a sphere of mind to perceive and investigate it.

This second sphere is an external one, and depends upon relation. As all causes are connected with the effects they produce through the means by and through which they operate to produce their effects, and as this sphere has reference to the *means* by which the primate as well as sequential causes operate to produce effects, this second sphere may be denominated the sphere of means.

This second sphere of mind is one of ideas, thoughts, images or imagination; and before it can communicate in any form, it must first possess the idea, thought or image which it seeks to communicate, and then, according to usage or education, must clothe the same with a more external form, so as to make it cognizable to the physical or first sphere.

Hence this sphere of mind must have an external or physical language to enable it to communicate with minds in the same sphere; and this language must be one of education—that is, it must be one which has been learned by external observation through the first or physical sphere, in connection with the second or rational sphere.

The mind belonging to this second sphere is individualized through the first, and is subjected to external influences through the first sphere. In its individualization it constitutes the conscious, thinking I myself; and this conscious, thinking identity is the sum of all the conscious influences by which I have been surrounded from the commencement of my individual existence.

This second or intellectual sphere of mind is the last in the chain of progressive individualization; that is, there is nothing individualized beyond this intellectual being. All further intelligence emanates directly from the great infinite Fountain, and is never individualized, separated or detached from it.

This second sphere of mind, joining upon the primate or Divine, becomes the eternal means of divine manifestation and divine impartment. The inmost of all things is God, whose "center is everywhere and whose circumference is nowhere;" who can not be limited or finited in his existence by time or space; who can inhabit no form, because all forms proceed from him and are in him.

This second sphere of mind or highest finite individuality, ac-

cording to its character and development, receives its influences or impressions from the interior or from the exterior. When this sphere of mind is individualized in harmony with the direct action and relation proceeding from the Divine, it then derives all its ruling thoughts, or rather feelings, from the Divine. Its loves and delights will harmonize with the Divine, and in all that appertains to its existence, it becomes one with God—finite, it is true, because it is finite in its individuality. In this condition its face may be always said to be turned toward God, as the face of man is turned toward those with whom he converses; hence the expression, "There the angels do always behold the face of my Father."

But if this sphere of mind is individualized in reference to the external, and is under the dominion of the falses and antagonisms of the external, it will derive its desires and feelings from the external, and it will receive little or no influx from the Divine; and such a character and condition of the mind is not capacitated to perceive the Divine; and hence it is properly described as being excluded from the presence of God.

This sphere of mind being in its nature exterior, and subject to influences from the exterior, is controlled, when acting from the things of its own or the lower sphere, by exterior influences called motives; and while under the dominion of the loves and delights of the external, is in a state of subjection to these external influences, and in this view such a mind is said to be in a subjective sphere.

This sphere of mind, when acted upon by the truths of its sphere, first thinks and then wills in reference to its thoughts; hence this sphere of mind, acting in this degree of wisdom, may be said to will from thought, and hence its will is subject to its thoughts; and as its thoughts are in a great measure subject to externals, which come and go unbidden, the mind in this sphere is in a state of bondage, and when it passes the controlling influences of this sphere, it is then described as coming into the "glorious liberty of the sons of God."

The character and phenomena appertaining to this sphere of mind will be more fully dwelt upon after we have described the third and highest sphere of knowledge and mind. Enough has

already been said to furnish the mind developed to its truths with an outline of its sphere; to one not thus developed more would not be appreciated.

THE THIRD SPHERE OF WISDOM AND MIND.

To this sphere of wisdom belongs the essentiality of all existence—even God. It is the source and fountain of all activity, or that from which all wisdom and power proceed. When viewed from this stand-point, the universe is present in one eternal NOW and HERE. Time and space cease, or are perceived to have only a relative and not an absolute existence.

That mind which perceives every department of existence in the essentiality of its nature, perceives it in all its simple and combined action. All its truths and phenomena are present in the essential nature of the principles. From this highest stand-point the ultimate WHY and HOW are solved, and all mystery ceases as ignorance dies.

This sphere of wisdom belongs to the interior or Divine, and can only be perceived as it is imparted or revealed by the Divine. Hence the remark of Christ, "No man hath seen the Father save the Son, and him to whom the Son hath revealed him;" and again, "The Son can do nothing of himself but what he seeth the Father do;" and again also, "I can of myself do nothing; as I hear I judge," etc.; and again, "For I have not spoken of myself, but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment what I should say and what I should speak, and I know that his commandment is life everlasting; whatsoever I speak, therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak."

This sphere of wisdom is beyond the sphere of thought. Thought necessarily localizes and limits. The principles of this sphere can no more be localized and limited than God. They appertain to the Divine in their mode of existence, and are universally present celestial truths.

This sphere of wisdom not being subject to thought, can not be revealed to the sphere of mere intellectuality, any more than pure intellectual truths can be revealed to the physical senses; because the intellectual mind can perceive nothing which can not

be embodied in thought; and as before observed, thought necessarily localizes and limits whatever it embraces, and it is upon this principle that the things of the flesh can not procure the things of the Spirit. Hence also, " Except a man be born again he can not perceive the kingdom of God."

Hence also it is that the intellectual man can have no rational idea of God, and consequently can have no true idea. All ideas which profess to embrace the Divine must necessarily be false and idolatrous; for that God which can become the subject of intellectual imagery, must be other than the Omnipotent, Omniscient and Omnipresent.

Hence it follows that the Divine can not reveal himself to a mind in the second sphere of wisdom, because such a mind is not capacitated to receive such a revelation; hence all attempts at communicating divine truths or principles through the instrumentality of oral or written language must fail of realization.

The truths of this sphere, to be perceived, must be felt. They must be incorporated into, and become a part of, the inmost consciousness of our being. Until divine truths are thus perceived, they are not perceived at all; and divine truths thus perceived can not be described or expressed by any external form of language, nor by any external figure. The inmost is so discreted from the exterior, that there is nothing in the exterior with which to liken it, or by which to represent it. Does any one doubt the possibility of possessing a conscious feeling which can not be embodied in thought, so as to cause others to understand it? The experiment is easily made. You are conscious of your personal identity; now, so clothe that consciousness in thought as to make one not possessing such a consciousness understand you, and when the task is completed the philosopher's stone will be found.

It has already been stated that this Divine exists in man, but is not individualized in him; that is, it has been stated that the intellectual principle in man was the ultimate of individualization in him, and as such it is not capacitated for perceiving the primate or Divine; that this intellectual principle is a thinking rather than a feeling principle. Now, as divine truths can only be perceived by being felt, how can they be revealed to man?

The answer is, that this divine principle is resident in the inmost of every immortal being, as an impartation of God. It is that breath of life in the higher sense, which the Almighty breathed into him when he became a living SOUL, created in the image of God. It is that little leaven hid in three measures of meal until the whole was leavened. It is the residence of this Divine principle in man joining upon the intellectual and thus connecting it with the Divine, which gives to the intellectual its immortal constitution ; hence the remark that the intellectual is immortal by relation.

Were not the intellectual connected with the Divine by the presence of this divine principle in the inmost of man, he could not be said to have been created in the image of God—he could not properly be considered the son and child of God ; he could not stand in the relation of a child to his parent. It was in this respect that Christ said, "Is it not written in your law, I said ye are Gods?"

It will be perceived that our description of this sphere of wisdom and mind must necessarily be of a negative character, because there is no form of external language which can set it forth. Its principles can not be perceived by the intellectual faculties, and consequently can not be represented or communicated. The most that intellect can do is to point in the proper direction, and say the principles of the Divine are beyond.

MAN IS CONNECTED WITH EACH OF THESE SPHERES OF WISDOM.

The material universe is constructed upon the plan of individualizing and unfolding immortal Spirit. The foundation of this individualization is laid in the mineral kingdom. The revolutions and changes which are wrought by the agencies which govern in that kingdom are preparing matter to be used in the individualizing process. Individualization commences in the vegetable kingdom, and then puts on its lowest form of manifestation in the individualized vitality of that kingdom.

This commencement of individualization could not have taken place had not matter been prepared for it through the elaborating

and refining action of electricity, magnetism, etc.; consequently the individualization of vitality depended upon the presence of suitable material for that purpose, and was aided or prevented by circumstances which governed such supplies.

Individualization depending upon the instrumentality of matter, electricity, etc., will be affected by whatever affects these supplies, or will be prevented or destroyed by whatever cuts them off; but we are no more to infer that vitality is destroyed by destroying the form of its manifestation, than we are to infer that electricity is destroyed by discontinuing the means by which it is manifested.

This individualization of vitality depending upon matter, electricity, etc., is in a state of subjectivity to matter, electricity, etc.; although vitality itself is not in such a state. In the individualization of vitality the incipient stage of selfhood is commenced—not a conscious selfhood, but that upon which a conscious selfhood could be predicated. Thus the simple *blade* of individualization began to appear.

As we proceed from the vegetable to the animal kingdom, where sensation begins to be manifested, we meet with an advance of this principle of individualization amounting to a *conscious* selfhood, predicated upon material facts. At this point of individualization, a consciousness of *exterior* being commences, but it only extends to the exterior. At this point existence can only be recognized as a fact.

Here also it is that volition or voluntary motion is introduced, by which the individual could arrange its relations to other existences. This stage of individualization is predicated immediately upon individualized vitality, and mediately upon that on which individualized vitality was predicated; hence this last advance of individualization is in a state of subjectivity to matter, electricity, magnetism and vitality. Here we have the "ear" of individualization, in sensation and voluntary motion.

It is important to notice that at this point of advance the conscious selfhood exhibits a mind suited only to observe the facts of the first sphere of wisdom; that it can not perceive the truths of the second sphere; that it is separated entirely from the ultimate cause by the absence of the intellectual principle; hence it

is not drawn after or attracted toward the Divine. This sphere of mind has to do only with the outmost of existence.

Hence also it is that this sphere of mind is in a state of subjectivity to the facts or phenomena of existence—to those things which have to do with its animal being; hence also its highest impulse to action must have reference to that animal being, and consequently must be selfish.

As we pass on to the next stage of individualization we come to man, who exhibits a further exterior selfhood, extending beyond that of physical fact or phenomena, and embracing that which joins upon the inmost or Divine. This conscious selfhood in man joining upon the Divine becomes double; that is, man possesses a consciousness of an exterior and an interior selfhood. The exterior selfhood connects him with the facts and truths of existence, and the interior connects him with the principles in the essentiality of their nature. The exterior connects him with the material and spiritual, and the interior connects him with the celestial and divine. In this last advance we have the "full corn in the ear" in individualized, immortal Spirit.

From the foregoing, Nature would teach us that this last advance in individualization was a birth into immortality of constitution and character, because it is based upon, and connected with, the imperishable reality of existence. Individualized sensation can only take notice of the outmost or accidentals of existence, disengaged from the inmost or divine reality. But individualized Spirit is predicated upon the truths, principles and reality of existence, and must endure until that upon which it is predicated fails, and hence must be immortal.

Here again we must notice the difference between the mode of existence of a thing and its mode of manifestation. In mode of existence it is independent; in mode of manifestation it is dependent or subjective. Thus vitality is independent of matter, etc., in its existence, while in its individualization it is dependent; so also is it with the nervous and other media.

As individualized sensation begets a conscious exterior selfhood, and as individualized spirit, joining upon the interior, begets a conscious interior selfhood, man, possessing both, becomes conscious of two selfhoods, the exterior and the interior—that is,

the selfhood of sensation and that of Spirit. This selfhood of sensation is first, and the selfhood of the Spirit next; or as expressed, "The first man is of the earth, earthly, the second is the Lord from heaven."

The selfhood of the Spirit is in a state of subjectivity to the selfhood of sensation during the process of individualization. During this period the individual is under the controlling influence of externals. When this spiritual individualization is perfected, and becomes free from the influence of externals, it is no longer in a state of exterior subjectivity; but until this point is attained the spiritual selfhood is subject to exterior influences, which determine the character and quality of its actions.

Now, as the plan of the material universe looks to the individualization and perfection of immortal Spirit, the end or ultimate must be to set the individualized Spirit free from this exterior subjectivity, and the aspiration or gravitating point of the Spirit must be toward the attainment of that freedom and perfection; and by carefully studying the impulses and aspirations of this interior selfhood, giving rise to its own peculiar activity, we shall find that it is struggling for this end.

Thus man possesses within himself the conditions of universal existence, from gross matter to the Divine. In his material body are found the materials which connect him physically with the material universe. He possesses individualized matter, vitality, sensation and Spirit, and is found in the path of progress growing up from the material to the Divine.

Thus man in his spiritual nature depending upon the exterior in the process of individualization, and being in a state of subjectivity to it, is brought into a state of bondage to nature and society, and consequently is subject to influences emanating from those sources, and will never act out the interior or Divine, until, for the time being, he becomes superior to, and independent of, these external influences.

So long as man is subject to these externals called motives, which induce in him actions depending upon them, and not upon the interior delights of the Spirit, so long will his actions be constrained, and not entirely his own—so long will he be in a state

of spiritual bondage, and the Spirit will be restless and unquiet, striving for its freedom.

Here the subject of man's free will or free agency comes up for consideration, and this vexed question demands an answer. Every immortal being has an innate consciousness of freedom to will or to choose, and yet experiences constant restraint or control.

So long as man is subject to external influences which affect or determine his choice, so long he is and must be conscious of restraint; so long as he is able to sit in judgment upon those influences, and admit or reject them, he is and must be conscious of freedom; so that man is conscious of both freedom and restraint; he is conscious that he is free to will, and yet he is conscious that choice is forced upon him.

The restraint to which he is subject arises from the influence which externals exert upon him. He finds that within himself which is subject to motives arising exterior to himself, and which not unfrequently become the masters of his choice. So long as man is subject to external influences, be they good or bad, they will make their impressions upon him, and more or less control his actions; and he can not be free to act out his own innate impulses and spontaneous volitions until he is free from such influences.

No one is wholly conscious of the extent to which his actions are controlled by external influences. No action of our lives which we perform in reference to an end to be accomplished, and when that end prompts the act independent of our delight in the action, can be said to be our free act. It is not that free will, that spontaneous going forth which characterizes the activity of the interior selfhood. Something exterior to, and independent of, the man, has called it into existence, and hence it belongs as much to the exterior influence as to the man himself. This position can not be escaped. If man is constitutionally subject to external influences, he is so far in a state of subjection to them, and the actions induced by them are not properly his own, be they meritorious or reprehensible, for such actions depended not solely upon himself, but upon influences out of himself.

Such is the character of all activity proceeding from the exterior, when the individual wills from thought, and not from feeling.

Is it affirmed that man possesses within himself the power to control his actions, independent of external motives? That might be true if this spontaneous will were constantly in exercise. But in such case the individual would cease to be in a state of subjectivity to external influences. He would then be independent of nature and society, and would act independent of motive; then he would no longer be under the dominion of the exterior, but under that of the interior or Divine.

Take an example you all can understand. You have left home to be here on the present occasion. Do you affirm that you came here of your own free will, and could have remained at home had you been pleased to do so? All that is granted, but your freedom is not yet established. You came here under an exterior influence operating upon your minds, and it was the strongest or prevailing influence operating at the time you left home, and under that influence, unrestrained as it was by counter influences, you could not have stayed away. The power within you to resist the influence of that motive to come here was not spontaneously active, neither did anything occur to call it into action. Do you reply you could have possessed a contrary mind had you desired? That is granted; but was your mind in that contrary condition? Your presence here demonstrates that it was not. Now, not possessing such a mind, and nothing occurring to induce it in you, how were you to resist? The sum of all the influences by which you were surrounded brought you here, and under their mandate you could not have remained at home.

We come, then, to this conclusion: you could have resisted the inclination to come here, had you possessed the will to do it. But that will you did not possess, and nothing occurring to induce in you such a will, you have come under an influence exterior to yourself. You may insist upon your power to will independent of motive, but that power is of no avail in a given case, unless it is exercised; and so far as its exercise is concerned, it must be spontaneous, or it must be induced by exterior influences. If it is to be spontaneous you must depend upon its

spontaneity; if it is to be induced by exterior influence, you must depend upon such exterior power for its exercise. So, then, the absence of your will to remain at home is conclusive evidence that such will was not spontaneously exercised, and also that no such exterior influence was present to induce in you such a will.

Looking at man, then, as dependent upon a spontaneous will, or upon one that must be induced in him by motives exterior to, and independent of, himself, to determine the character of his actions when the will is not spontaneously exercised, he must be in a state of subjectivity to external influences, and hence all such actions in him are not, strictly speaking, his own—that is, they belong as well to the external motive as the man. When this external motive is the influence or persuasion of a rational being, we recognize him as a participant in the act.

What, then, is the conclusion? Is man a machine, acting only as he is acted upon? By no means. Man, in his interior selfhood, is as free as God himself; and it is from this interior that he is bound to act, if he would act out the loves and delights of God.

Notwithstanding man, in his exterior selfhood, is in a state of subjectivity to nature and society, yet he is conscious of the most perfect freedom; and while he feels the force of externals drawing him this way and that, he, at the same time, feels within himself a power to resist all such influences, and he feels that such power resides within him, forming a part of his inmost being.

SECOND AND THIRD SPHERES OF KNOWLEDGE AND MIND.

Hence there arises in man a double consciousness, or more properly a consciousness of two antagonistic states—one of subjectivity, and one of perfect freedom. The selfhood in a state of subjection is the exterior one, which connects him with nature and society, and brings him under the dominion of motives. The selfhood which is free and independent is the interior or Divine, which disclaims all exterior influences, and acts only according

to its interior loves and delights; and hence it is in this inmost selfhood where reside this conscious freedom and power, which are constantly proclaiming their sovereignty and independence, and ignore nature and society; they know nothing of necessity, duty, obligation or law; they are superior to them all.

This interior conscious selfhood is the real Divine, the God within, which, when it wills, wills like God; when it speaks, speaks like God, and when it acts, acts like God—which, in short, is God in man. It is the presence of this Divinity in man which makes him the “temple for the living God to dwell in;” hence also the remark, “the kingdom of heaven is within you.”

Hence it is that when man is conscious of being in a state of subjection he is conscious of a truth, and when he is conscious of perfect freedom he is also conscious of a truth. Exterioly he is in bondage to nature and society; interiorly he is as free as God himself; and man, in his activity, is constantly giving forth indications of these two selfhoods. He feels, with Paul, a law within his members, warring with the desires and delights of his Spirit, so that when he interiorly would do good, evil exteriorly is present with him, bringing him into bondage.

When man shall properly understand the existence and relation of these two natures, he will then be able to lay the foundation for correctly estimating character; he will be able to trace all activity to the source from whence it emanated.

The differences manifested in individual characters depend first upon the relative development of the exterior and interior natures, and second, upon the character of surrounding externals by which the exterior man is governed.

The external is not necessarily in antagonism with the internal in the action performed. They may both induce the performance of the same actions, which, in their effects upon others, are not distinguishable, while in their relation to the individuals performing them they are entirely different. Thus, in performing an act of charity by feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, etc., the hungry and naked derive the same benefit from the food and clothing, independent of the consideration whether the act proceeded from an exterior or interior impulse. But not so with

those who perform the act; hence the caution, "Take heed that you do not your alms before men to be seen of them, otherwise ye have no reward of your Father which is in heaven."

The true philosophy of this position will be explained hereafter; hence, in judging of the quality of actions in their effects upon the actors, we must distinguish between those of the exterior and those of the interior. The exterior is distinguished by that which acts in reference to exterior influences or motives, when the soul of activity is not in the action, but in the end to be accomplished through the action. The interior is characterized by being spontaneous and free, acting from its own interior loves and delights, independent of any external object to be gained, where the soul of activity is in the action, and not in any object out of the action. The exterior mode of action is imperfect and without character; the interior mode is perfect, and expresses character.

The man under the influence of externals is properly characterized as being under the law, while the man under the loves and delights of the interior is "freed from the law," and is born into the "glorious liberty of the sons of God;" hence it is that the law is necessary for the exterior man, to convince him of sin or error, and hence it is that by the knowledge of the law man is made acquainted with sin; and hence also is it that by the *deeds* of the law can no flesh living be justified; because the law, being exterior, acts only from the exterior upon the exterior, and hence acts not from the perfect or Divine; hence it is that the law is denominated a "schoolmaster" leading the exterior man in the direction of the Divine.

As the physical and intellectual nature of man, connecting him with the facts and truths of the universe, belong to the exterior selfhood; and as his education from his birth is designed to develop and strengthen the exterior, and as everything by which he is surrounded, and of which he becomes conscious through his physical senses or intellectual perceptions, operates upon his exterior nature to call it into action, it is not surprising that there is such a disproportionate development between his exterior and interior nature.

Again, all the ordinary pursuits of man have sole reference to

the exterior nature, whether they are designed to provide the mere necessaries, comforts or luxuries of life; whether pursuing after fame, wealth or power, the exterior nature is exercised, and, if possible, is gratified. In truth, man is so engrossed in exterior activity, that it is a serious and doubtful question with him whether he possess any other nature.

Man, in a state of dependence, is peculiarly under the dominion of this exterior nature; he does not feel at liberty to consult his tastes or interior pleasures. The necessity for food, clothing, shelter, etc., the demands of those who are dependent upon him, and civil and social obligations, are constantly calling him away from his own interior promptings, and he is constantly obliged so to direct his activity as to accomplish certain necessary ends. Man often feels this slavery, and is forced to exclaim, "I would not do this, and I would not do that, but necessity compels me."

How little of the physical and mental activity of man is expressive of his inmost choice! He who labors to provide for himself a support is compelled to his task by exterior necessity, and he feels his bondage. Take away the prospect of reward and his labor ceases. He has no interior delight in his toil. Such labor develops only his exterior nature, because that only is exercised by it. The farmer plows and sows with an eye single to the harvest which is to follow; if that fails him, he counts his labor lost. The hireling thinks of his wages, and is anxious to have the days pass away, and the time of his service ended.

The merchant enters upon his trade because it promises to furnish wealth, or the means of supplying the demands of his exterior nature; let the prospect of gain cease, and he would abandon the counter and the counting-room. He is not in the work. That is irksome only as the prospect pleases.

The professional man selects and enters upon his profession in prospect of the reward it promises, and he abandons it when he fails to realize his expectations, or having realized them, feels no further occasion to labor, thus showing that he did not pursue his profession from an inward delight.

The student is consumed while he consumes the midnight oil, that he may feed and clothe himself, that he may enjoy the name of wisdom, and occupy a reputable position in society; the so-

called artist perpetrates his daub that he may feed his body, cover his back or inflate his name, and the priest thinks of the tithe, and has good care to be on the side of wealth and influence. His call to preach is never so expressive as when expressed in dollars; and thus it is through the whole routine of life—man's activity is expressive of his subjection.

Since man is thus under the dominion of the externals in the whole round of his activity, and is often, like the galley slave, driven to his task by exterior necessity, how is his real character to be estimated. When the father, made desperate by hearing the moans of his dying babes, becomes a highwayman to procure them bread to save them from starvation, is he prompted by love for his children, or by a delight in the deed he feels himself constrained to do? How shall his guilt be estimated by him who looks upon the heart? Was that act interiorly his, and his alone?

No, his dying babes were accessories to his crime; they plead in strains of matchless eloquence for bread, and a father's heart could not deny their prayer, although he trod the burning lake to grant it.

The power which externals thus hold over man makes it necessary that we estimate their force before we can justly determine how much of the man there is in his exterior activity. This exterior action proceeding from man's subjection is not expressive of the real character of the unit man. He who pursues any calling for the love of it, independent of any reward it promises to bring, in that pursuit gives expression to the inmost, the Divine, and Divinity will appear in all such activity.

The poet whose effusions are the spontaneous gushings forth of his soul; who thinks not of the opinions and prejudices of society; who ignores all restraints of rythmical or metrical law, but who speaks because he feels, and speaks what he feels—speaks as from the eternal throne with the authority of God, and gives expression to the Divine, which finds an echo in the inmost of every soul that hears. His poem awakens pulsations in man's inmost being, and causes an instinctive struggle for freedom and life.

The artist who bends over his easel and touches his canvas to

fulfill his inmost delights, also gives expression to the Divine. His eye is illuminated by the light of heaven; he plucks his colors from the bow of spirit; his imagery is self-created, and his hand is guided by the Divine; and his work, when completed, is a reflection of Divinity; a painted immortality.

The orator—when he speaks from the inmost—when feeling and not thought provokes his utterance—when he has but to open his lips, and the purest, holiest, deepest sympathies of his soul spontaneously gush forth; when, under the inspiration of the moment, sensation and thought fade and die; when his whole being seems to expand and throb with an electric thrill—is then the mouth-piece of Divinity. His words are clothed with a sort of divine energy and power; they penetrate to the inmost of those who hear, lay hold of their souls and stir them to action; and for the time being, the exterior is held in bondage to the interior; the eyes are fixed, the lips stand apart, breath is suspended, and the whole external being seems to be paralyzed; and as the spell passes away, and thought again succeeds to feeling, the deep-drawn breath again indicates the return of exterior consciousness.

Thus is it with every expression of man's inmost delights. Every act which proceeds therefrom is divine, and harmonizes with the Divine; and this divinity can be seen in the humblest callings of life, in every grade of activity, from the cobbler to the king. Whatever is performed under the sole promptings of the interior delights of the soul is indicative of divine activity, whether performed by saint or devil.

Why does the mother love her babe? What impulse prompts that constant care and watchfulness? Whence arises that tender solicitude for its welfare and happiness? Does she stop to consider duty, obligation, law? Does she attend upon her little one because she feels the force of that duty or obligation? No. She ignores all duty, obligation and law in her ministrations. She acts from a higher impulse—from the interior promptings and delights of her soul. Talk to her of her *duty* to love her babe, and if the divine of the mother be present, she will recoil from such profane, unnatural talk. There is that in her which is superior to all considerations of duty or obligation.

The language of true friendship proceeds from the Divine. The true friend can give no exterior reason for his friendship, because it depends not upon that which is exterior for its existence. It is the result of the innate and interior harmony within, which spontaneously lives, and feels, and acts. Externals do not affect it; it lives and triumphs as well in adversity as in prosperity.

Much that is called friendship is exterior and selfish, and depends upon motives for its existence. Such friendship will continue no longer than motives prompt its continuance. It is based upon favors past, present or prospective; a change of circumstances will destroy it. But true friendship is divine, and will be as eternal as the soul. No force of circumstances can destroy it.

Such also is the nature of true love. That deep oneness of feeling, sympathy and delight proceeds from the same divine fountain. Deep in the inmost soul, upon the altar of the heart, its pure flame burns, and sheds a holy light which hallows and purifies all it reveals. Under favorable circumstances, it extends its sway over the whole exterior being, and purifies, elevates and ennobles it. External circumstances and conditions can not kindle its flame, nor can they quench it.

"Our hearts ne'er bow but to superior worth;" that is, the interior and divine acknowledge no worth but the Divine. It has no affinity for any action which is not spontaneous and free; it recognizes the man only in the free, self-induced feeling and action. If the hero, in his defence of the just and the true, is prompted by selfish motives, like that of personal influence, wealth, power, or self-aggrandizement, however noble or generous the deed may appear, the interior has no respect for it. Let the philanthropist become obnoxious to the charge of a selfish ambition in his labors, and his moral power is at an end; let it appear that Washington acted from any other motive than a disinterested love for freedom and justice, and the magic of his name would cease.

Thus it is, and thus it must be—the interior of man can only be pleased with that which proceeds from the inmost, and is spontaneous and free. Man can only interiorly please himself,

when he feels that his actions are his own, uninduced by selfish motives. All there is in the history of the past which challenges the admiration of the world, partakes of this exterior character.

The difference between the works of art and nature is the difference between the human and the Divine. The former are cold, stiff, formal, lifeless, counterfeit, unreal; the latter are warm, free, instinct with life, real, divine. The exterior artist, or more properly speaking, the artizan, strives to imitate. He must study rules, that he may work from thought; he is constantly under the restraint of law, and can proceed no further than rule or law provides. The interior or real artist creates; he ignores all rules, and works from feeling; his hand obeys the spontaneous guidings of his inmost being, and his work becomes instinct with feeling and life—a mirror of the divine.

Such then is man—"a worm, a god,"—not so mysteriously united in his two natures as the poet ignorantly imagined; exteriorly a worm, interiorly a god; exteriorly a slave, interiorly free. Here, then, is the foundation for studying the true character of man, standing upon the earth and reaching into the heavens—a volume in the great library of God, wherein is recorded every phase of divine being and manifestation.

This interior nature, in its feeling and action being spontaneous, must be essentially active; its volitions being spontaneous, that is, self-induced, must be independent in their mode of existence in man; hence this interior nature must be essentially active and self-impressive, hence must be essentially divine; and when it speaks, wills and acts, it must reveal the Divine.

This conclusion is inevitable, when we consider the personality of man. The essentials of a distinct personality are, that the individual, in his being and action, shall be separate and distinct from every other being; if he is necessarily blinded or united with others, he has not obtained a distinct personality.

Personality implies that the subject and object of volition and action shall fall within the individual being—that is, that the individual shall possess within himself the power to will and act independent of exterior influences. What constitutes personality in any being? What distinguishes one being from another, so as to give rise to the self-conscious entity of I myself, separated

and detached from all other beings or personalities? It is not in the existence of any particular faculty of the body or mind, for all possess the same or similar faculties; it is not in the predominance of any particular faculty, nor in the peculiar combination of faculties. Those are only means of giving expression to this interior selfhood. This personality of being must be essentially life and action, hence must be an impartation of God; and hence man in his inmost must be like God in all he wills and loves.

Hence also is it true that man in his inmost is in the "image of God;" therefore, when the exterior nature is brought under the dominion of the interior, man will exhibit the divine humanity of which Christ was an exemplification. This interior nature is the "good man of the house" of which Christ speaks, "which must first bind the strong man armed" before he can "spoil his goods"—that is, destroy the fruits of his activity; which simply means that this interior nature must bring the exterior nature of man into perfect and complete subjection to its inmost loves and delights; then divine harmony will be established, and the true at-one-ment will be made between man and God—between the human and the Divine.

This conclusion can not be avoided. Man in his inmost must be spontaneous; if he is not, he can not be the author of his own activity; if he is created or exists as a being acting from his innate spontaneity, he must be essentially godlike in his spontaneity, or he can have no power to harmonize with God. Man interiorly can not act counter to the innate spontaneity of his being, and he is no more responsible for that innate spontaneity than he is for being at all.

If man in his inmost is totally and innately depraved, and acts from the spontaneous desires and impulses of that nature, he is not to be censured for his depraved activity. Being spontaneous in his inmost activity, he must abide that spontaneity of action, and neither God nor man can justly censure him for it. He would be just as censurable for existing at all as for possessing a nature which, from its false and depraved constitution, gives forth only spontaneous depravity.

If man in his inmost constitution is pure and upright, then in the spontaneity of his inmost loves and delights, he acts only in

obedience thereto, and for such action he is entitled to no merit or especial reward. All he can claim or desire are the blessings which naturally and inevitably flow from being in harmony with the Divine, so that man in his inmost is entitled to neither censure nor praise; he has nothing of which he can boast or of which he can be ashamed. Man in his inmost is a projection of the Divine, and hence is as like God as God is like himself. His personality is in God; hence the expression, "In God we live and move, and have our being." His immortality of constitution and character arises out of this divine personality; hence man in his inmost can not be condemned of God, for God can not condemn himself—can not be forsaken of God without ceasing to exist; hence the expression, "We are temples for the indwelling of the Holy Spirit.

Again, if man in his inmost is not essentially God, perfect and complete, he never can harmonize with him; for being spontaneous in his inmost, he must abide his inmost spontaneity, which, if false, can never be made true, short of annihilation and re-creation; but man in his inmost is divine, and is destined to come into divine harmony, and to progress and develop eternally in his capacity and consequent receptivity.

PROPOSITION.

DEVELOPMENT implies receptivity; and no existence can develop unless it can receive that which is necessary for, and suited to, its condition and being.

Hence all development comes under a law which is fundamental to the existence to be developed; and whatever influence will not harmonize with such law will hinder, if not utterly prevent, such development.

Hence that can not develop an existence which is under a law adverse to the fundamental condition of the existence to be developed.

Hence that which is received to be incorporated into the existence to develop it, must harmonize with the fundamental condition of such existence.

SPIRITUAL PHENOMENA.

WE publish the following extract from the works of Plutarch, as showing the resemblance between modern and ancient spiritual manifestations. It is valuable for its antiquity, combined with its almost exact concordance with similar phenomena of to-day. This extract is taken from notes by the translator of Jung Stilling:

"Thespesios of Soli lived at first very prodigally and profligately; but afterward, when he had spent all his property, necessity induced him to have recourse to the basest methods for a subsistence. There was nothing, however vile, which he abstained from, if it only brought him in money; and thus he again amassed a considerable sum, but fell at the same time into the worst repute for his villainy. That which contributed the most to this was a prediction of the god Amphilochus; for having applied to this deity to know whether he would spend the rest of his life in a better manner, he received for answer 'that he would never mend till he died.' And so it really happened in a certain sense; for not long afterward, he fell down from an eminence upon his neck, though he received no wound, yet he died in consequence of the fall; but three days afterward, when he was about to be interred, he received strength and came to himself. A wonderful change now took place in his conduct, for the Cilicians knew no one who at that time was more conscientious in business, devout toward God, terrible to his foes, or faithful to his friends; so that those who associated with him wished to learn the cause of this change, justly supposing that such an alteration of conduct, from the greatest baseness to sentiments so noble, could not have come of itself. And so it really

was, as he himself related to Protogenus, and other judicious friends.

"When his rational soul left the body, he felt like a pilot hurled out of his vessel into the depths of the sea. He then raised himself up, and his whole being seemed on a sudden to breathe, and to look about it on every side, as if the soul had been all eye. He saw nothing of the previous objects, but beheld the enormous stars at an immense distance from each other, endowed with admirable radiance and uttering wonderful sounds, while his soul glided gently and easily along, borne by a stream of light in every direction. In his narrative he passed over what he saw beside, and merely said that he perceived the souls of those that were just departed rising up from the earth; they formed a luminous kind of bubble, and when this burst, the soul placidly came forth, glorious and in human form. The souls, however, had not all the same motion; some soared upward with wonderful ease, and instantaneously ascended to the heights above—others whirled about like spindles, sometimes rising upward and sometimes sinking downward, having a mixed and disturbed motion. He was unacquainted with the most of them, but recognized two or three of his relatives. He drew near them and wished to speak with them, but they did not hear him, for they were not wholly themselves, but in a state of insensibility, and avoiding every touch; they turned round, first alone in a circle, then, as they met with others in a similar condition, they moved about with them in all directions, emitting indistinct tones, like rejoicing mixed with lamentation. Others again appeared in the heights above, shining brilliantly, and affectionately uniting with each other, but fleeing the restless souls above described. In this place he also saw the soul of another of his relatives, but not very perceptibly, for it had died while a child. The latter, however, approaching him said, 'Welcome, Thesprios!' On his answering that his name was not Thesprios, but Aridaios, it replied, 'It is true thou didst formerly bear that name, but henceforth thou art called Thesprios. Thou art, however, not yet dead, but by a particular providence of the gods art come hither in thy rational spirit; but thou hast left the other soul behind as an anchor in the body. At present and in future, be it a sign by which thou mayest distin-

guish thyself from those that are really dead, that the souls of the deceased no longer cast a shadow, and are able to look steadfastly at the light above without being dazzled.' On this, the soul in question conducted Thespesios through all parts of the other world, and explaining to him the mysterious dealings and government of divine justice—why many are punished in this life, while others are not—and showed him also every species of punishment to which the wicked are subject hereafter. He viewed everything with holy awe; and after having beheld all this as a spectator, he was at length seized with dreadful horror when on the point of departing, for a female form of wondrous size and appearance laid hold of him just as he was going to hasten away, and said, 'Come hither, in order that thou mayest the better remember everything!' And with that she drew forth a burning rod such as the painters use, when another hindered her and delivered him, while he, as if suddenly impelled forward by a violent gale of wind, sank back at once into his body, and came to life again at the place of interment."

We also subjoin another extract from the same notes, for the purpose of offering certain suggestions as to the probable philosophy of such phenomena. It is as follows:

"The late Rev. Jos. Wilkins, dissenting minister at Weymouth, dreamed in the early part of his life a very remarkable dream, which he carefully preserved in writing as follows: 'One night, soon after I was in bed, I fell asleep and dreamed I was going to London. I thought it would not be much out of my way to go through Gloucestershire and call upon my friends there. Accordingly I set out, but remembered nothing that happened by the way till I came to my father's house, where I went to the front door and tried to open it, but found it fast. I then went to the back door, which I opened and went in; but finding all the family were in bed, I went across the rooms only, went up stairs, and entered the chamber where my father and mother were in bed. As I went by that side of the bed in which my father lay, I found him asleep, or thought he was so; then I went to the other side, and just turned the foot of the bed. I found my mother awake, to whom I said these words, "Mother, I am going a

long journey, and I come to bid you good-by;" upon which she answered me in a fright, "O, dear son, thou art dead!" With this I awoke, and took no notice of it more than a common dream, only it appeared to me very perfect, as some dreams will. But in a few days after, as soon as a letter had reached me, I received one by post from my father, upon the receipt of which I was a little surprised, and concluded something extraordinary must have happened, as I had lately had a letter from my friends, and all were well. Upon opening it I was more surprised still; for my father addressed me as though I was dead, desiring me if alive, or whosoever's hands the letter might fall into, to write immediately; but if the letter should find me living, they concluded I should not live long, and gave this as a reason for their fears: That on such a night, naming it, after they were in bed, my father asleep and my mother awake, she heard some one try to open the front door; but finding it fast, he went to the back door, which he opened, came in, and came directly through the rooms up stairs, *and she perfectly knew it to be my step.* I came to her bedside and spoke to her these words, "Mother, I am going a long journey, and am come to bid you good-by;" upon which she answered me in a fright, "O, dear son, thou art dead!" which were the very words and circumstances of my dream; but she heard nothing more, and saw nothing, neither did I in my dream, as it was quite dark. Upon this she awoke my father, and told him what had passed, but he endeavored to appease her by persuading her it was only a dream; she insisted it was no dream; for that she was as perfectly awake as ever she was, and had not the least inclination to sleep since she had been in bed. From these circumstances, I am apt to think it was the very same instant when my dream happened, though the distance between us was a hundred miles; but of this I can not speak positively. This occurred while I was at the academy at Ottery, Devon, in the year 1754, and at this distance of time every circumstance is still fresh upon my mind. I have since had frequent opportunities of talking over the affair with my mother, and the whole was as fresh upon her mind as it was upon mine. I have often thought that her sensations as to this matter were stronger than mine. What some may think strange, I can not remember that anything remarka-

ble happened hereupon. This is only a plain, simple narrative of a matter of fact."

Stilling, in one of his later publications (Pocket-Book for the Friends of Religion, 1814), relates a similar incident which was communicated to him in a letter from Baron Von Sulza, chamberlain to the king of Sweden, dated Soderkoping, Dec. 4, 1812. The Baron writes as follows:

"I had been paying a visit to one of my neighbors on the 24th June, 1799, and returned home about midnight, at which time it is so light in Sweden in the summer season, that one can see to read the smallest print. On arriving at our estate of Dienstdorp, my father met me before the gate of the courtyard in his customary clothes, with a stick in his hand, which my brother had ornamented with carved work. It was very light, and I saw everything clearly; I was not afraid, for I really believed it was my father. I saluted him, and conversed a long time with him. We then went together into the house, and upon the level floor into the room, on entering which I saw my father quite undressed, lying in bed in a profound sleep, and the apparition had disappeared. He soon awoke, and regarded me with an inquiring look. "My dear Edward," said he, "God be thanked that I see you again, for I was much troubled on your account in a dream, for it seemed to me that you had fallen into the water, and were in danger of drowning." I was greatly astonished at finding my father asleep in bed, and regarded the apparition as a forerunner of his approaching death; but he lived three years after this event. I now told him what had happened to me; that he had appeared to me, and that I had spoken with him on several subjects; on which he replied that *this had often occurred to him*. It is also remarkable that, having gone to the river the same day with the friend whom I was visiting, in order to catch crabs, I was really in danger of falling into the stream.

"I testify upon my soul that all this is truth; and if you publish this account, let it be done in my name, for I am not ashamed of confessing the truth."

The following very remarkable dream is related in the *Times* newspaper of 16th August, 1828:

"In the night of the 11th May, 1812, Mr. Williams, of Scov-

rier house, near Redruth, in Cornwall, awoke his wife, and, exceedingly agitated, told her that he had dreamed that he was in the lobby of the House of Commons, and saw a man shoot with a pistol a gentleman who had just entered the lobby, who was said to be the Chancellor, to which Mrs. Williams naturally replied that it was only a dream, and recommended him to be composed, and go to sleep as soon as he could. He did so, but shortly after again awoke her, and said that he had the second time had the same dream; whereupon she observed that he had been so much agitated with his former dream, that she supposed it had dwelt on his mind, and begged of him to try to compose himself and go to sleep, which he did. A third time the same vision was repeated, on which, notwithstanding her entreaties that he would be quiet and endeavor to forget it, he arose, it being then between one and two o'clock, and dressed himself. At breakfast, the dreams were the sole subject of conversation, and in the forenoon Mr. Williams went to Falmouth, where he related the particulars of them to all his acquaintance that he met. On the following day, Mr. Tucker, of Tremanton Castle, accompanied by his wife, a daughter of Mr. Williams, went to Scorrier house about dusk. Immediately after the first salutations, on entering the parlor, where were Mr., Mrs., and Miss Williams, Mr. Williams began to relate to Mr. Tucker the circumstances of his dream; and Mrs. Williams observed to her daughter, Mrs. Tucker, laughingly, that her father could not even suffer Mr. Tucker to be seated, before he told him of his nocturnal visitation; on the statement of which Mr. Tucker observed that it would do very well for a dream to have the Chancellor in the lobby of the House of Commons, but that he would not be found there in reality; and Mr. Tucker then asked what sort of a man he appeared to be, when Mr. Williams minutely described him; to which Mr. Tucker replied, "Your description is not at all that of the Chancellor, but is certainly very exactly that of Mr. Perceval, the Chancellor of the exchequer; and although he has been to me the greatest enemy I ever met with through life, for a supposed cause, which had no foundation in truth (or words to that effect), I should be exceedingly sorry indeed to hear of his being assassinated, or of any injury of the kind happening to

him." Mr. Tucker then inquired of Mr. Williams if he had ever seen Mr. Perceval, and was told that he never had seen him, nor had ever even written to him, either on public or private business; in short, that he had never had anything to do with him, nor had he ever been in the lobby of the House of Commons in his life. At this moment, while Mr. Tucker and Mr. Williams were still standing, they heard a horse gallop to the door of the house, and immediately after, Mr. Michael Williams, of Treviner (son of Mr. Williams of Scorrier), entered the room, and said that he had galloped out from Truro (from which Scorrier is distant seven miles), having seen a gentleman there who had come by that evening's mail from London, who said that he was in the lobby of the House of Commons on the evening of the 11th, when a man called Bellingham had shot Mr. Perceval, and that, as it might occasion some great ministerial changes, and might affect Mr. Tucker's political friends, he had come out as fast as he could to make him acquainted with it, having heard at Truro that he had passed through that place in the afternoon, on his way to Scorrier. After the astonishment which this intelligence had created had a little subsided, Mr. Williams described most particularly the appearance and dress of the man that he saw in his dream fire the pistol, as he had before done of Mr. Perceval. About six weeks after, Mr. Williams, having business in town, went, accompanied by a friend, to the House of Commons, where, as has been already observed, he had never before been. Immediately that he came to the steps at the entrance of the lobby, he said, "This place is as distinctly within my recollection in my dream, as any room in my house;" and he made the same observation when he entered the lobby. He then pointed out the exact spot where Bellingham stood when he fired, and which Mr. Perceval had reached when he was struck by the ball, and where and how he fell. The dress of both Mr. Percival and Bellingham agreed with the description given by Mr. Williams, even to the most minute particular.

"The *Times* states that Mr. Williams was then alive, and the witnesses to whom he made known the particulars of his dream were also living, and that the editor had received the statement from a correspondent of unquestionable veracity."

Cases of the foregoing character might be cited to an almost indefinite extent, showing that the Spirits of persons still in the form may appear at great distances from their physical bodies.

When we examine cases of clairvoyance, we find the subject often perceiving objects at a great remove from the reach of physical sensation, showing other means of sight and perception than those addressing the natural eye and other natural faculties. Thus, a person in New York clairvoyantly perceives another person in the city of London, under circumstances which preclude all doubt of the actuality of such perception. This fact shows that the mind of the clairvoyant is either in London, or by some means the individual in London is spiritually represented in New York, for there is communication between them.

Is the mind of the clairvoyant in London as a place removed from New York? While this vision is going on, other minds in New York are in *rapport* with the clairvoyant, holding conversation, etc., and obtaining correct responses to their questions. Now, if the mind of the clairvoyant is in London, how do the minds of those who are in New York come into conscious rapport with the clairvoyant? How is it that speaking in New York is heard in London? The difficulty is only increased by supposing the mind of the clairvoyant to leave the body and go to London for the purpose of making the examination.

By some means the person in London is spiritually represented in New York, and the clairvoyant perceives such representation. This may be done in two ways: first, through the instrumentality of a medium extending from the one place to the other, which shall be to the Spirit what light is to the physical body; so that the Spirit, in its condition and action, may be represented thereby, as the image of the body is represented through the medium of light. In this way the Spirit in London may be represented in New York, and the clairvoyant in New York, being in *rapport* therewith, may perceive such representation.

By the same law of representation, also, the Spirit of the clairvoyant in New York is represented in London; so that should the person in London be in a clairvoyant condition, he could perceive such representation; and the two clairvoyants, being thus mutually in *rapport*, would spiritually meet and hold con-

verse, although in point of actuality they were separated by the ocean. In this way persons in the body may meet in spirit, and such meetings, for the time being, have all the appearance of actuality. Mutual and simultaneous clairvoyance would enable two persons to meet in spirit, no matter how far in point of space they might be separated.

In the second place, this spiritual representation may take place according to the laws of psychologic impression. Thousands of facts have demonstrated the existence of the faculty of making psychological impressions. One mind, when in *rapport* with another, can impress its thoughts, feelings and images upon the other, and in this way communicate with such other mind. In this way one mind may perform the office of a *mirror* to reflect the condition and action of another mind, and thus spiritually represent such mind by such reflection. That such reflection may, and does take place, has been demonstrated many thousand times by experiments in animal magnetism. Operators have represented to their subjects persons, places and things far away, and given to them the appearance of present actualities.

In this way the spiritual presence of those in the form may be represented in places far removed from their bodies; so, when phenomena like those before cited occur, it will require special examination to ascertain whether they are the result of the first or second class of causes; whether they are the simple representation of the condition and action of the person or thing in the spiritual atmosphere or medium, or whether they are a psychologic reflection from the mind of a Spirit; and by a careful attention to the phenomena and the laws producing them, it can be determined whether they belong to the first or second class.

If the phenomena belong to the first class, they will be a simple representation of the phenomena without any addition or diminution. Take the case of Mr. and Mrs. Wilkins above cited: Their mental states were not the same. Thus the mental state of Mr. Wilkins was that of traveling, making an effort, trying to enter the house, seeing his mother, etc.; while that of Mrs. Wilkins was that of being in bed at home, hearing a noise at the door, hearing footsteps ascending the stairs, seeing her son enter the room, hearing him speak, etc. Now one condition of

mind was not the reflection of the other, for in no respect were they alike. This, then, would indicate that the case of Mr. Wilkins is not to be explained by referring it to the first class, or simple clairvoyant representation, but rather to the second class, or psychological reflection from the mind of some other being.

PROPOSITION.

EVERY existence has its appropriate sphere; and within such sphere its action and influence is harmonious, and tends to its greatest good.

Hence every degree of conscious perception and affection have spheres appropriate to such degree, and within such spheres all legitimate action will harmonize and tend to good.

Hence any effort at reducing a higher condition or existence to a lower one, must introduce antagonism and tend to disturb the harmony and destroy the good.

Hence, to degrade the spiritual to the plane of the animal affections and impulses, produces the discord and evil known as vice and crime.

Hence the antagonism of the flesh and spirit are the result of the effort to subjugate the spiritual nature to the laws and impulses of the animal nature.

Hence these antagonisms, according to their strength and resistance, demonstrate the life and power of the spiritual in its opposition to the animal affections.

Hence the pains and sufferings of the Spirit are evidences of a life and sensitiveness which it would not possess if that nature were subdued.

Hence all pain is corrective in its natural tendency, and will ultimate in proportionate good.

A SHORT SERMON.

"I will never leave thee nor forsake thee," saith the Lord. "I am on thy right hand and on thy left." "The Lord encompasseth thee as with a shield." Now these expressions of truth are the outburstings of the soul's desire, and their truth lies not in their source but in their spontaneity. All sincere men labor not so much for a purpose, as because their work is a necessity of their being. All such, feeling their insufficiency, call for aid beyond themselves. They know that as the desire for the higher is ever-present with them, so something beyond must be able to help them to the attainment. The soul calls *that* God which it places on the pinnacle of its aspirations. God is the ever-present help, because the knowledge of a higher possibility to the soul reveals *that* possibility as a certainty; and the call for God is for the help of that certain and aspired-for end, which, when attained, will have its God yet to cry unto and aspire to reach. The constant and earnest longing of the soul for something beyond its present life is the law of its progress, which, being infinite, will never cease. To dwell with God, and therefore be at peace, is not to attain unto the *highest*, but is to recognize the laws of one's being, and, obeying them, to advance ever nearer the soul's aspired-for end, without distrust or fear, but with certain reliance on the good of the now and the to-come. No more can the soul divorce itself from God, and therefore from the help it desires, than from its life. "I will hear when you call;" "I will open when you knock." The need is the certain revelator of the supply. Do you need help, it is yours through the law of your being, but remember *that* help is best which comes through your own highest life. Your prayer is answered often by the condition into which you lift yourself by your aspiration for divine aid. You become at-one with a higher life, and you are and do what accords with that life.

LOVE M. WHITCOMB.

JUSTICE CONSIDERED.

EQUITY demands equivalents. Exchanges between men should be upon the principles of equity, and therefore should obey the law of equivalents. If any other principle be adopted in exchange, the principles of justice will be violated, and a system of inequality and oppression will be built up. This is the radical difficulty with our present system of commercial intercourse; exchanges are not made upon the principle of equity, or that of rendering equivalents.

In making exchanges, it is necessary that there be some measure by which to ascertain the equality of the articles exchanged. In our present commercial transactions that measure is money, having what is generally supposed to be a fixed or standard value; but it will be found on examination that money has no more fixedness in value than any other article of commerce. Demand and supply affect its price as much as the price of any other commodity. The half bushel, the yard stick and the balance may furnish standards of weight and measure, but they do not furnish standards of value. It must be obvious to every one that if we use any instrument as a standard of measure, either of quantity or value, that instrument must have the quality of fixedness. If it has not that quality, it is unfit for a standard. A yard-stick which would expand and contract one-half its length according to the state of temperature, would be considered a very poor standard of length. So with whatever is adopted to measure value. If its own value is constantly changing, it is totally unfit for a standard. This is particularly the case with money; and especially is it so where the currency is made partly of coin and partly of bank paper.

It is well known that the abundance or scarcity of money af-

fects very sensibly the nominal price of other articles. When money is abundant, property commands a good price and usually finds a ready sale; when money is scarce, property commands but a small price and finds but few purchasers. Now that which makes this difference in the nominal price of property, is in reality the difference in the price of the money. It is subject to the principles of demand and supply. The demand being very great and the supply being very small, there is a great competition among those seeking money, and the holders of it take advantage of that competition to extort a large price for it. Is it claimed still that property has changed its value, and not money; that a dollar is a dollar still? I answer, a horse is a horse still, and can render as much service in labor as when money is plenty; but the horse will not command as much money when money is scarce as when it is plenty, although the demand and supply for horses remain unchanged. The value of money being greater when the supply is small, it takes a less quantity of it to measure the value of a horse than when it is cheaper.

Now, unless some means can be ascertained and adopted by which value can be reduced to a fixed and immutable basis, so as to be accurately measured when exchanges are made, the principle of value must be abandoned, or equitable exchanges can not be made. If the nature of value be such that it can not be fixed, but must change with every change of circumstances, it can not be used as a measure of equity. Let us for a moment consider the philosophical meaning of the term value, and see whether it can be used as a measure to determine equitable exchanges; because we must conduct exchanges upon principles of equity if we would secure to all their just rights.

Upon what does the value of an article depend, and to whom does the consideration of value belong? Value depends upon circumstances, and is aptly illustrated by the anecdote of the traveler who found a bag of pearls when he hoped it was bread. The substance of the anecdote is as follows: A traveler in a desert was reduced to the point of starvation, when, coming to a fountain, he saw a bag lying upon the ground. He eagerly seized it, thinking it might contain bread; but upon opening it he expressed his bitter disappointment by the exclamation, "O, it is

"nothing but pearls!" A loaf of bread at that time and place would have been of more value to him than all the pearls in the universe. Necessity has often much to do in determining the value of an article; its value may be inestimable where the necessity is imperative. A draught of cold water to the famishing traveler may be of more value than all the wealth of the Indies. Value is not an intrinsic, but an accidental quality, and consequently has no standard, and can not be used as a standard; it can only be regulated by supply and demand. If the supply is greater than the demand, it will depreciate; if the demand is greater than the supply, it will appreciate.

Value depending upon supply and demand does not depend upon the cost of production. It may be sometimes above, and sometimes below, that standard; so that value can lay no foundation for equitable exchange; it furnishes no criterion of what is right or wrong between the parties; it is no measure of justice or injustice. Under its rule the producer may be the oppressor, or he may be oppressed. The value of an article is for the consideration of the buyer, and not of him who wishes to sell in equitable or just transactions.

If I am to sell an article to you, it is none of my business to inquire what the article is really worth to you. Your circumstances may be such that it may be indispensable to you; your life, health, or the health and life of some of your family, may depend upon your being able to possess it. Hence its value to you may be beyond all price; and because your necessities imperatively require it, am I to take advantage, and consider your necessities in fixing the price, and thus become an extortioner? If I have the article for sale, and wished to sell it, can I, on principles of justice and fair dealing, demand a farthing more in consequence of your necessities or in consequence of its value to you, than though you were under no necessity?

Suppose your house to be on fire, and you must use my fountain to obtain water, or it will be consumed; in that case the use of my fountain might be worth hundreds and thousands of dollars to you; am I therefore entitled to consider the value of its use to you, and charge you a hundred or a thousand dollars for a few pails of water?—or suppose you need my ladder to ascend

the roof to rescue your child from the flames, am I entitled, for the use of my ladder, to such a sum as your necessities would induce you to pay? Yet the principle of the seller's taking into account the necessities of the buyer in fixing the price of the article to be sold, would justify me, in that moment of your extremity, to charge you your entire fortune for the use of my ladder to rescue your child; and every individual who, in making exchanges or in selling property, takes into consideration, and takes advantage of, his fellow's necessities, is guilty of resorting to such a principle.

The price of an article, then, is not to be regulated by its value to the purchaser. He can and will take that into consideration in determining whether he make the purchase, and it is for him alone to consider, and not for the seller; and in considering it, it is not his business to inquire what the seller can afford to take for it. It is the business of the seller to set his price, and for the purchaser to say whether he can afford to give it or not; and if the parties intend to deal on equitable and just principles, the seller, in fixing his price, will set it at what he can afford to take, considering its cost, and the buyer will give what it is worth to him, considering its use, if it exceed not what the seller can afford to take.

Is it asked, is not the seller to take into consideration what the article is worth to him? and is it not worth to him what it will bring in market? In the first place I answer, the seller is to take into consideration what it is worth to him, if his necessities require him to use it, and he can not supply its place after he has parted with it; but if his necessities do not require him to use it, or if he can readily supply its place at the same cost, he is not in equity entitled to take into consideration what it is worth to him, that worth being measured by what it will bring in market. The maxim "that a thing is worth what it will bring," is false and unjust, and involves in it every principle of unjust and oppressive dealing. The seller is not to consider any such value if he would deal upon equitable principles.

Let us spend a few moments in considering the principle "that a thing is to be valued according to what it will bring." A thing will bring just what the necessities and ability of an individual

will compel and enable him to pay. Suppose I was embarked on board of a vessel which was on fire, and in a few hours at most the passengers must commit themselves to the waves; suppose I was in possession of the requisite number of life-preservers to furnish each passenger with the means of saving his life, and without such means they all must perish. Now my life-preservers would command any price the passengers had the means of paying. Now would the application of the principle "that a thing is worth what it will bring," be a just principle for me to adopt in selling my life-preservers to the passengers? Would it not be rank injustice and downright robbery for me to act upon that principle. And yet, why should not the principle be applied as well in this case as any other? It only involves the same ingredients—necessity and ability.

Again, suppose you had been bitten by a mad dog, and it becomes certain that you must die of hydrophobia unless some remedy is speedily administered. I alone possess that remedy, and can administer it. You are worth ten thousand dollars, and have the ability to pay that sum, and would be willing to pay it to be cured of that awful malady. Now a thing is worth what it will bring, and my skill and a few farthings' worth of medicine will bring ten thousand dollars; am I, therefore, to charge ten thousand dollars as the only condition upon which I will administer to your necessities? Certainly I am, if I am to obey the principle that a thing is worth what it will bring; and if that criterion for determining price is just in one case, in principle, it is just in all cases; the principle is the same; circumstances must determine the magnitude of its results.

Again, your house is on fire, and your family have been driven to the roof, and there is no way of escape except by a ladder. I have the only ladder that can be obtained in season for their deliverance; now what would you not give, within your ability, for the use of my ladder, rather than see your wife and children perish in the flames? Would you not rather beggar yourself for life? Am I therefore to resort to the principle "that a thing is worth what it will bring," and extort from you your present and your future all as the condition upon which you may use my ladder? If the maxim is just "that a thing is worth what it

will bring," why not? It is your misfortune to be placed in such necessitous circumstances, and my good fortune to find you there. And so I might continue on indefinitely to illustrate the injustice and barbarism of the maxim "that a thing is worth what it will bring." That maxim being true, it authorizes every individual to take the utmost advantage of the ability and necessity of this fellows.

Value depending mainly upon the circumstances of necessity and ability, ought never to be referred to by the seller. On the principle of justice, he should only consider what he can afford to take, leaving it to the purchaser to determine whether he can afford to pay the price or not. This principle of taking advantage of necessity has been demonstrated to be the one upon which business is transacted in the commercial world, and out of this principle of plunder has arisen the practice of graduating the price according to the necessity and ability of the purchaser, called the value of the article; and although utterly unjust and inequitable, it is the highest rule of justice and morality which prevails in the trading world. There are certain extreme cases when the moral sense of mankind would revolt from the application of that principle; but the difference in those extreme cases and ordinary business transactions consists not in principle, but in the degree of its manifestation.

From the foregoing considerations, it must appear evident that an equitable commercial intercourse can not be carried on between men, so long as they act upon the principle that a thing is to be valued according to what it will bring. We come, then, to this inquiry: Ought men, in their intercourse with each other, to attempt to be just and upright? If they ought to be so, are they justified, as honest men, in doing business upon unjust and inequitable principles? And can a man be considered honest and just, who will in any manner knowingly violate the principles of integrity and fair dealing? Must not the principle of determining the price of an article by the necessity and ability of the purchaser be abandoned as dishonest, unjust and oppressive?

As all crimes in respect to property take their character from the injustice they work upon their victims, and from the reckless disregard of the claims of justice and right on the part of the

criminal, are not the principles upon which commercial transactions are conducted essentially criminal, and do they not tend to induce the commission of crime. And this being so, is it just for men to punish others for doing what they themselves have taught them, and what they are also constantly committing? And beside, can we hope to reform the world by any system of ethics which tolerates the practice of commercial intercourse?

Another question arises: Is there no principle in nature adapted to the condition and wants of man, upon which a system of equitable commercial intercourse can be established? If there is not, and commercial intercourse be necessary, then the Author of all existence has been guilty of a great omission in the structure of his government. He has imposed upon man necessities which compel him to be dishonest and unjust, and yet makes it criminal in him to be so. If injustice and wrong are criminal, there is no way of avoiding the conclusion unless there are principles simple and practicable upon which commercial intercourse can be conducted consistent with the demands of justice. If there is a way in which such intercourse can be conducted consistent with justice, then it is the imperative duty of man to walk in that way, and it is criminal in him to depart from it.

Believing in the perfection of the divine government, I can not impeach either the wisdom or goodness of God, by doubting that there are principles exactly suited to maintain justice and right between men in their intercourse with one another; nor can I doubt that any neglect of those principles will involve men in injustice and oppression; for we can not deviate from the right way without being involved in wrong in any department of the divine government. The extreme injustice which now prevails in society; the fact that those whose toil and sweat produce the necessities of life, are not the ones permitted to enjoy them, speaks of an evil somewhere which works out the rankest injustice—an evil which results from a violation of a divine arrangement. The extremes which prevail in society, of princely wealth and squalid poverty, also indicate the same thing. The disrespect and unfashionableness of useful labor which is so essential to the temporal and spiritual well-being of man, is certain evidence of the working of a false and unjust principle somewhere

According to every principle of right and justice, who ought to be most esteemed and respected in society? Certainly those who are the most useful; those upon whom society must depend for all it possesses that is useful and necessary; those who are the pillars and support of society. And in what class are these individuals to be found? To what class do they belong? To the laboring class; those who by their own exertions produce as much and more than they consume; those whose labor produces the food and clothing, the books and means of instruction; those who make the greatest sacrifices of ease, who perform the most repulsive offices. If the principles of the divine government prevailed, the laboring classes would be the first and most respected classes in society. It is their right, and nothing but falsehood and injustice denies it to them.

Why should those who place themselves above work; who seek to avoid and evade the duty to be useful and industrious; who refuse to earn their bread, and live in idleness; who attach themselves like parasitic excrescences upon society, and live by plundering the laborer of his hard earnings, be considered the most respectable? What have they ever done to challenge admiration? Wherein have they been useful or beneficial to society? They live on the fat of the land; they clothe themselves in purple and fine linen; they repose in beds of down, but they do it at the expense of the toiling poor. Their costly living compels the poor laborer and his family to feed on crusts, and clothe themselves in rags or the coarsest attire; their splendid mansions compel the humble laborer to seek shelter in a hovel. Then why should the rich idler be honored above the poor laborer? Is it just? Is it honest? Is it right? Is idleness honorable? Is wealth plundered from those who produce it to be respected? Then down with your jails; let your penitentiaries be razed from their foundations; do homage to thieves, robbers, counterfeiters and pirates!

These things should not be so; and under a just and wholesome state of society these things would not be so. The laborer is entitled to what there is of wealth, and he is entitled to respect and honor; and if any should be poor and disrespected, it should be the idler and vagabond; it should be that man or woman who

refuses to do his or her part toward sustaining the burdens of life. Hitherto society has existed upon a false basis—an animal and selfish basis—and it has not yet progressed beyond it. It commenced where man first emerged above the mere animal, and hence commenced on the lowest basis. Its highest conception of right was founded in might; and although those views have been somewhat modified, yet they have never yet been fully abandoned. But the time is fast approaching when the age of brute force will be past, and the divine character of right and justice will begin to be understood.

The age of chivalry, although not entirely past, is fast passing away. Its meridian age was in the days of knight-errantry, since which time its power and influence have been on the decline. The office of general does not now confer so much honor as the humblest one formerly conferred. Thus it will continue to decline, until the business of training to cut men's throats will become positively disreputable, when the age of chivalry will expire. We are now in the midst of the commercial age. Wealth is more respectable than military accomplishment, and our sons are trained for some commercial employment, instead of being educated for the army. In this there is evidence of advance. Although the pursuit of wealth as an end of attainment is foreign to the true interest and destiny of man, and prevents the full development of the spiritual faculties, yet it is not so directly antagonistic to its development as the practice of chivalry. But as the age of chivalry will pass away, so will also the commercial age; as the age of chivalry was an age of force, so is the commercial age one of fraud; as it was honorable in the days of chivalry to be powerful, so is it honorable in the commercial age to be wealthy. The position in society which the possession of power gave to the chivalrous, and which the possession of wealth now gives, was and is the great stimulus to action. These were and are the controlling motives; and so long as the influence of public sentiment shall harmonize with chivalry and wealth, so long will men be ambitious to be chivalrous and wealthy.

But the sword and epaulette no longer command respect. The general feeling is becoming adverse to military pomp and display. The name of corporal and sergeant, etc., are no longer

respected, and men no longer care to be called by those names. For this cause the mass are not ambitious of military distinction; a few weak minds in Society, who are unable to appreciate that which is high and ennobling, seem anxious to put on the trappings which better men have put off, thinking that the honor is in the trappings, and not in the men who wear them; but even these men will eventually learn that they can gain nothing by such childish display, and there will end the last vestige of knight-errantry.

In the same way will the age of commercial ambition pass away. Property will cease to have any value except for its practical use; and men will cease to be valued upon any other basis than that of their usefulness. Instead of power and wealth challenging respect, truth, integrity and virtue will alone command it; and when men find that honest industry is more honorable than indolent or licentious wealth, men will be more ambitious to supply their own wants by their own honest industry, than to accumulate fortunes by plundering the poor laborer. The first step, then, toward preparing men for the great reform which is now knocking at our doors, is to unmask wealth and show its innate depravity and deformity; show the dishonest and corrupt state of mind that seeks; show how it must be obtained, if obtained at all, by defrauding labor of its just dues; that the wealthy worldling must from necessity be false to man, false to the claims of justice and truth. The man who makes his own fortune can not be guiltless, no matter what means he uses to obtain that wealth; whether he turn pirate and plunder the world, whether he arm himself and become a private robber, or whether he seek it by stealth or fraud, or by the application of the ordinary rules of commercial dealing, to make his own fortune he must obtain the possession of wealth earned by others; and whether he obtain it lawfully or unlawfully according to human enactments, he must obtain it by plunder.

Let these things be understood, and let the poor laborer, upon whose shoulders the commercial world rests, and without whom it could not continue for one month, understand his importance. Let him understand that all the idleness and luxury of wealth is a tax upon him, and that the splendid mansions of the rich, and

their magnificent churches and public buildings which adorn wealthy cities, are the expenditures which drive him and his little ones into the hovel; that the sumptuous living of these wealthy idlers is what compels him to feed his family on crusts and bone-soup; that their purple and fine linen is what clothes himself and family in rags. I say, let the honest and industrious laborer understand this, and would he feel any respect for wealth. Would he take off his hat and bow down his head like a bulrush, and speak with "bailed breath, and in a bondman's key" when these legal plunderers stood before them? Would he not rather stand erect, with an honest pride and a just indignation, and claim the rights and the respect due to his manhood? Would he not lay his broad and callous hand upon his heart, and say, "I too am a man, and such a man as have *earned* the bread I eat, as well as that which you have eaten; I am not dependent upon you, but you are upon me; therefore I, as your superior in condition, must be permitted to decline your dictation."

Whenever wealth shall cease to be respected, and men shall be esteemed according to what they are rather than according to what worldly goods they possess, there will be less inducement to seek after that which honest industry and just dealing can never obtain, and consequently there will be less inducement to be unjust and dishonest. Destroy the respectability of wealth, and men will direct their energies in another and higher direction; but so long as man's position in church and state depends upon his wealth in any degree, so long the hope of heaven or the fear of hell can not keep men from being dishonest or unjust. Public sentiment is more powerful to encourage or restrain vice than all other influences combined.

The time when men shall not seek to lay up for themselves treasures upon earth, will be the time when honest industry will be rewarded with that respect due to it; when honesty and integrity, justice and fair dealing, will prevail; when those who, from false notions of what is honorable, shall refuse to soil their hands with work, shall refuse to do their part in sustaining the burdens of life, shall not only not be respectable, but shall be obliged to receive their bread as a charity, and assume the character and position of mendicants. The maxim that "He that will not work

shall not eat" is an honest and just maxim ; he that can not work is entitled to his support, but he that can and will not has little claim for respect or sympathy, and can not complain if he has neither.

Modern developments encourage us to expect the time soon when justice and right will prevail over force and fraud? We can not doubt but that an influence is being awakened in favor of that which is honest and just. Humanity is manifesting itself in every department of social reform. The true dignity of humanity is beginning to be understood, and the rights of man are being studied and vindicated. The oppressions of despotism in every form are beginning to be felt, and the slaves are becoming restive; they never can again be quieted. The decree has already gone forth. Man will be man, free and independent, and he can be crushed but little longer. Having been plundered by power for ages gone by, he will not submit to be plundered by fraud when he has overthrown the power. Men are beginning to understand the nature of justice and right, and when they shall fully understand their claims, they will not permit them to be neglected.

And at this important juncture in the progressive history of the world, what could be better timed than that new revelations from the Spirit-world should be made to us, to cause us to feel and understand our true nature and destiny—to weaken our attachments to the weak and perishable things of this life, and cause us to look to the more substantial realities of our future existence? Without such aid the philanthropist might well have become discouraged. Finding church and state, wealth and power on the side of wrong and oppression; finding Offence's gilded hand holding the bribe to buy out Justice, and Justice in the hands of those who were willing to make merchandise of her, what was there to hope for?

But I must beg pardon for this digression from my subject. I was about to investigate the question upon what principles can exchanges be made, so as to secure justice and equity to the laboring man and woman? There is a just criterion by which equity can be measured out, and justice done to all; but that criterion will never be adopted by society, so long as the prevailing

desire and design is to be unjust, so long as that which can not be obtained except by injustice is the *sine qua non* to respectability.

In the first place, that which nature has provided for the use of man without his care or labor, should not be the subject of property. Put an end to all property and proprietorship in the soil *per se*, and permit no other property to exist therein than the amount of labor bestowed upon it to make it valuable. By so doing, one of the most fruitful sources of injustice and fraud will be dried up. Drive the monopolizer from the soil, and you will destroy one of the chief means by which one man may live in idleness, and levy tribute upon the labor and toil of the poor about him. There is perhaps no way, considered criminal or otherwise, which so effectually and so extensively plunders the poor laborer as the system of land monopoly; no way by which such immense fortunes are built up by individuals without rendering any equivalent for them. Let all proprietorship in the soil cease, and the foundation will begin to be laid for making equitable exchanges; let the measure of value be the amount of beneficial labor bestowed upon the land, and there will be no land speculations.

As all actual wealth is or should be the product of labor, the measure of value in any given article should be the labor it costs; that is, the cost of the article should be determined by the amount of labor it takes to produce it, and that cost will be the limit of its price; for it will at once be perceived that no other equitable rule can be adopted. Suppose I demand, in money or labor, for the product of my labor more than my article cost me, the consequence will be inevitably that some one must take less than the cost of their article, or they could not pay me more; and it matters not through how many hands these articles may pass before this exorbitant demand is made, when it is made and complied with, some person is wronged—injustice has somewhere been done.

Suppose, as an attorney, I charge a client for five minutes' advice five dollars—a very common thing with some attorneys. Now, when he pays me five dollars for so slight a service in point

of time and labor, he is defrauded out of nineteen-twentieths of his labor; for if he earns his money by honest industry, it will take him a hundred or a thousand times as long to earn and possess himself of that five dollars with which he paid me for five minutes' service, as it took me to render the service for which I charged him the five dollars. Now I can not charge and take such a fee without doing as rank injustice as though I had passed a counterfeit note. Some person was obliged to earn that five dollars by patient industry, and some person between the producer and myself has been defrauded, or I never could have obtained that five dollars for five minutes' service.

Whenever you hear of an individual making, as it is called, one, two, three, five or ten thousand dollars per year, set it down that labor is being plundered to that amount—that in his exchanges he is not rendering equivalents. He may be plundering a little here and a little there, but all this enormous gain is made up of plunder. Somebody must earn this money, and having earned it, must part with it without receiving an equivalent for it; for the very hypothesis that he has made ten thousand dollars is predicated upon the supposition that he has received ten thousand more than he has given in equivalents; that is, that what he has received is worth ten thousand dollars more than what he has given, therefore his gain has been others' loss. Now this is not equitable; it is not just; and the fruit of this injustice is seen in the two extremes of society, the independently wealthy and the wretchedly poor; is seen in the one class laboring from birth to death to keep body and soul together, without time or opportunity to educate and develop the immortal spirit, barely feeding on the coarsest food, and scanty at that, and clothing themselves in the coarsest attire, and ragged at that.

I will not here stop to trace all the evils which accrue to society in consequence of this injustice, but will merely say it is a prime cause of nine-tenths of all the social and moral evils which curse society. If exact justice was done to labor, it would be attractive and honorable, and none would think of living without it. Men would not seek to avoid it by becoming pirates, thieves, counterfeiters and robbers; there would be little or no induce-

ment to the commission of crimes against the property rights of their neighbors; idleness and vagabondism, whether rich or poor, would be disreputable, and men would seek to avoid it.

Let it then be settled as a principle not to be violated without censure, that justice demands equivalents in the exchange of the products of our labor. It will take nothing more, it will be satisfied with nothing less; and he who will not heed the demands of justice in this respect is purposely unjust, and can not be trusted as a dispenser of justice. When I know what justice demands and refuse to do it when in my power, what is my character? And should you also disrespect its demands, what is your character? How in principle are you and I superior to the thief, the counterfeiter and pirate? These are serious questions, and more important to be considered than you may at first imagine. When we are knowingly, willfully and habitually unjust and dishonest in our ordinary business transactions, the descent is easy, gradual and natural to the commission of acts of the grossest dishonesty and injustice.

Here I might take my stand and moralize upon the omnipotent authority of the higher law. In a previous article I assumed that it was universal and omnipotent, and would be obeyed; that we could not thwart its legitimate action, whether we came into harmonious relation with its existence or not; that its legitimate and just action was seen as well in our destruction as in our salvation, and the only criterion which determined whether it would bless or curse, was to determine whether we would come into harmonious or discordant relation to it. The same principle, that blessed us when we placed ourselves in harmonious relations with the divine government, was the one which cursed us when we came into antagonistic or discordant relations to it, and that its power to bless would not exist if its power to curse was taken away. The fire would have no power to warm me, and cook my food or propell my machinery, should you destroy its power to burn or consume me, when I came into improper relations to it.

Thus it is with the principles of the divine government in this respect. In the intercourse of man with man, the higher law demands equal and exact justice, and it will be obeyed or it will

curse. Let men come into harmonious relations with the demands of justice and right, and they will be blessed with the richest blessings of the divine government. Society will then be harmonious, and all will possess the means of comfort and true happiness, and there will be no inducement for one man to deprecate upon the rights of another; but let the claims of justice be disregarded, let right be trampled under foot, and force and fraud usurp the place of justice and right, and by all the power there is in the divine government to bless, will it curse such antagonistic and inharmonious relations to itself. The lesser pirate shall be destroyed by the greater, and he who resorts to force and fraud to plunder the poor shall become the victim of force and fraud in return. He who would undermine the foundations of society by denying the principles upon which society alone can be based, must not be disappointed when he finds himself involved in the ruin he has courted.

PROPOSITION.

THE union of the perceptions and the affections of the mind begets its volitions; that is, the volition or will of the mind is determined by the ruling affection or love in respect to its perception of the object of its will.

Hence the character of one's volitions depends upon the character of his ruling love, in connection with his understanding and perception.

Hence all voluntary actions are expressive of the love and understanding which begot them.

Hence man's voluntary actions furnish a basis for determining the character of the love and understanding, which determine the character of the man.

COACOCHEE'S TALK.

We publish the following Indian Talk as a fine specimen of the native eloquence of the sons of the forest. It also shows how the love of friends and relations may dwell in the same breast with hatred for foes—how tender the heart may be toward one, at the same time its vengeance is burning toward another. We shall ere long furnish a chapter on the philosophy of these conditions.

The "talk" of Coacoochee, or Wild Cat, to Colonel Worth and to his own people, exceeds, in point of pathos and deep feeling, anything we ever heard.

A captive and in irons, he had been told by Worth that he had been brought back from New Orleans to Tampa Bay for the purpose of aiding in bringing the war to a close at once. He was told that he might select five of his companions, who should be permitted to go to his band, then in the swamps, and induce them to come in. "Name the time," said Worth; "it shall be granted; but I tell you, as I wish you to tell your friends, that unless they fulfill your demands, yourself and these warriors now seated before us shall be hung to the yards of this vessel when the sun sets on the day appointed, with the irons on your hands and feet. I tell you this that we may understand each other; I do not wish to frighten you, you are too brave a man for that; but what I say I mean, and I'll do it. It is for the benefit of the white man and the red man. This war must end, and you must end it."

Coacoochee rose, and turning to Colonel Worth, said, in a subdued tone, "I was once a boy, then I saw the white man afar off. I hunted in these woods with a bow and arrow, then with a rifle.

I saw the white man and was told he was my enemy. I could not shoot him as I would a wolf or bear; yet like these he came upon me—horses, cattle and fields he took from me. He said he was my friend; he abused our women and children, and told us to go from the land. Still he gave me his hand in friendship; we took it; whilst taking it he had a snake in the other; his tongue was forked like the serpent; he lied and stung us. I asked but for a small piece of these lands, enough to plant and live upon, far South, a spot where I could place the ashes of my kindred, a spot only sufficient to lay my wife and child upon. This was not granted me. I was put in prison; I escaped; I have been again taken; you have brought me back; I am here, I feel the irons in my heart. I have listened to your talk; you and your officers have taken us by the hand in friendship. I thank you for bringing me back; I can now see my warriors, my women and children; the Great Spirit thanks you—the heart of the poor Indian thanks you. We know but little; we have no books which tell all things; but we have the Great Spirit, moon and stars; these told me last night you would be our friend. I give you my word; it is the word of a warrior, a brave, a chief—it is the word of Coacoochee. It is true I have fought like a man, so have my warriors; but the white man was too strong for us. I wish now to have my band around me and go to Arkansas. You say I *must* end the war! Look at these irons! Can I go to my warriors? Coacoochee chained! No; do not ask me to see them. I never wish to tread upon my land unless I am free. If I can go to them *unchained*, they will follow me in; but I fear they will not obey me when I talk to them in irons. They will say my heart is weak. I am afraid. Could I go free, they will surrender and emigrate."

He was told in the most impressive manner that he could not be liberated until his entire band was collected at Fort Brooke; then he might go on shore and meet them unshackled. He saw that his fate was inevitable. The vessel was two miles from shore sentinels were posted in every part of the ship, and escape by stealth or contrivance was impossible. As the reality forced itself upon his mind that there were but two alternatives, he became sad

dejected. He gathered his warriors about him, and selected five who were to go to his band and inform them of the strait in which their chief and his fellow-prisoners were placed.

"Has not Coacoochee," said he, "sat with you by the council-fire when the wolf and the white man was around us? Have I not led the war-dance and sung the song of the Seminole? Did not the spirits of our mothers, our wives and our children stand around us? Has not my scalping-knife been red with blood, and the scalps of our enemy been drying in our camps? Have I not made the war-path red with blood, and has not the Seminole always found a home in my camp? Then will the warriors of Coacoochee desert him? No! If your hearts are bad, let me see them now; take them in your hands and let me see that they are dark with bad blood, but do not, like a dog, bite me so soon as you turn your backs. If Coacoochee is to die, he can die like a man. It is not my heart that shakes; no, it never trembles; but I feel for those now in the woods, pursued night and day by the soldiers; for those who fought with us until we were weak. The sun shines bright to-day; the day is clear, so let your hearts be; the Great Spirit will guide you. At night, when you camp, take these pipes and tobacco, build a fire when the moon is up and bright, dance around it, then let the fire go out, and just before the break of day, when the deer sleeps and the moon whispers to the dead, you will hear the voices of those who have gone to the Great Spirit; they will give you strong hearts, and heads to carry the talk of Coacoochee. Say to my band that my feet are chained. I can not walk, yet I send them my word as true from my heart as if I was on the war-path or in the deer hunt. I am not a boy; Coacoochee can die, not with a shivering hand, but as when grasping the rifle with my warriors around me.

"My feet are chained, but the head and heart of Coacoochee reaches you. The great white chief (Po-car-ger) will be kind to us. He says when my band come in I shall walk my land free, with my band around me. He has given you forty days to do this business in; if you want more, say so, I will ask for more, if not, be true to the time. Take these sticks; here are thirty-nine, one for each day; *this*, much longer than the rest, with blood

upon it, is the fortieth. When the others are thrown away, and this only remains, say to my people that with the setting sun Coacoochee hangs like a dog, with none but white men to hear his last words. Come then; come by the stars, as I have led you to battle! Come, for the voice of Coacoochee speaks to you!

Say this to my wife and child——" He could not continue. Sobs choked his utterance as he thought of those loved ones, and he turned away to hide the tears which coursed down his cheeks. Not a sound disturbed the silence which pervaded the assembly, and officers and men, women and warriors, testified, by their tears, their sympathy for the poor chieftain. In silence the chains were removed from the five messengers, and they prepared to depart. As the last one was going over the side, he removed from his person a handkerchief and breast-pin, and giving them to him, told him to hand them to his wife and child.

Forty days and nights were passed by the chieftain, as well as by the officers, in the most intense anxiety, and it was nearly as much to their relief as to that of Coacoochee and his fellow-prisoners, when the sun rose on the fortieth day and found the entire number, seventy-eight warriors, sixty-four women and forty-seven children, encamped within the bounds of Fort Brooke.

PROPOSITION.

MORAL perception must precede moral love; and while the moral perception precedes the moral affections, the condition and action known as hypocrisy takes place.

Hence the hypocrite outwardly has respect for the good of others, and conforms to the externals of truth, purity and love, that he may serve himself; that is, he perceives what is good and proper to be done for others, but being in self love, he is induced to do only so far as it will redound to his advantage.

Hence moral perceptions may exist in an individual while he is yet under the dominion of his selfish affections; and as moral affection develops, there must necessarily arise antagonism, and this antagonism will continue until self is destroyed.

WHAT IS THE USE OF THESE MANIFESTATIONS?

THE present condition of the world must have satisfied every inquiring mind that some new development must take place, furnishing more palpable evidence of the immortality of the soul and the existence of the future life, to save the world from material atheism, as well as to furnish a more efficient means for redeeming man from his vices and crimes.

More than eighteen hundred years ago, an individual made his advent into this world, which was heralded by an angelic choir, who sang over the plains of Judea, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, and good will among men." He lived on earth thirty-three years, and while here taught those truths and illustrated those principles which are necessary to be observed and kept to redeem the world from its errors, vices and crimes. We are told he established a church into which were to be gathered all true believers, and from which a light was to go forth to enlighten, redeem and save the world, and realize to coming generations the fulfillment of that prophetic song of "Peace on earth, and good will among men;" and we are further told that the church thus established has existed until the present, and is truly represented in the orthodox churches of the nineteenth century. These churches, then, being the professed instruments of human redemption, come up for examination.

I suppose the progress which this church has made in converting the world to the doctrines of Jesus Christ during the last eighteen hundred years, may be considered a fair type of what it will be likely to accomplish for eighteen hundred years to come; and certainly it can not be objected that the result of its labors for the last fifty years should be taken as something of a measure of its capacity and power as a means of human redemp-

tion. I propose to examine this question in the light of the past and the present, and ascertain whether these institutions can be relied upon as a means of redeeming the world, or whether they must be abandoned, and higher and better standards be elevated.

Without stopping at this time to inquire into the origin of those evils which affect society by debasing, oppressing, crushing and destroying its members through the instrumentalities of vice and crime, it will be sufficient for present purposes to say that they are the offspring of man's ignorance, and the false, selfish motives which prompt him to action; and without stopping to investigate minutely the philosophy of Christianity, as being that which lays the axe at the root of these evils, it is enough for present purposes to say that it is designed and perfectly adapted to remove that ignorance, and to do away with those false and selfish motives to action, and thereby to become a means, perfect and complete, of human redemption.

The question now to be discussed is this: Is the Christianity of the nineteenth century, as taught and practiced by these orthodox churches, competent to fulfill this great work of redeeming man, and establishing "peace on earth and good will among men?" I say it is not, and will make my assertion good by appealing to its fruits, and will discuss, in future articles, the reasons why it is not sufficient for the work.

The fashionable Christianity of the age does not affect the character of its possessor enough to make him distinguishable in his daily deportment, social and business habits, and other relations in life, from the man of the world. Every person will be my witness that we can not tell who are and who are not professed Christians and members of orthodox churches by dealing with them, or by becoming acquainted with them in the civil or social walks of life. We must ask for special information, or see them in the performance of some outward ceremony, practiced only by church members, or we may live by them for years without suspecting them to be professing Christians. The proposition is this: The virtue and morality of modern Christianity is not enough above the virtue and morality of the world to enable an observer to tell the difference.

Modern Christianity is popular with the world, and has become

a means of entering fashionable society or getting into a lucrative business. But the reason Christianity has become popular, is not because the world has been converted to its truths or reconciled to its principles. The world is as proud and lustful and selfish as it was the day it nailed Christ to the cross, and it hates those divine truths with as perfect a hatred now as then; and should Christ appear again, and preach the same truths he then preached, and enforce them with the solemn earnestness he then enforced them, the world would again cry out, Away with him! crucify him! crucify him! No, the world has not been converted to Christianity, but Christianity has been converted to the world. The compromise has been upon the side of the professing Christian.

Modern Christianity has no conflict with selfishness, or pride or luxury. It is not in a state of antagonism with war, oppression, or any of the national sins of the age. The faith now required to be believed, the sacrifices now required to be made, and the life now required to be lived, can be professed, made and lived by a heartless hypocrite. It requires no humility to become a member of a fashionable church, which the proudest can not exercise without effort; it requires no poverty of spirit which the most self-conceited can not easily assume; it requires no change of business which the most avaricious and worldly-minded can not make without injury to his worldly prospects; it requires not of him that has an abundance to give one farthing to the poor and needy; it allows its members to pursue with the same spirit, and adopt the same measures for their accomplishment, all the various objects of selfish ambition which the selfish spirit of the world adjudges honorable and proper; in short, the Christianity of the nineteenth century does not give tone to the morality of the world, but takes its tone of morality from the world.

Such is the character and influence of modern Christianity. Aside from certain speculative creeds and external forms and ceremonies, it is not to be distinguished from the world. How, then, is the world to be reformed, redeemed and saved by it? How, by its influence, is the true atonement to be made between man and God? That an ATONEMENT has been made can not be

denied; but in that ATONEMENT Christianity has been reconciled to the world, not the world to Christianity. That this is the character of the present type of Christianity can not be denied; that such is its manifestation in individuals, states and nations is as true as God; and after eighteen hundred years of preaching and practicing this kind of Christianity, where stands the world? "Watchman, tell us of the night." Look about and tell me what has been accomplished? What great national sin has been reached, and eradicated from society? What has been done to bring about the fulfillment of that prophetic song of "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace and good will among men?" Where is the prospect of the coming of that time "when swords shall be beaten into plowshares and spears into pruning-hooks, and nations shall learn war no more?" Has the day-star of that millennial morn even risen upon our earth? When has Christianity in its purity obtained a foothold among the nations of the earth?

Since the days of Constantine the Great there have been professedly Christian governments and governmental Christian churches; and our divines talk about Christian nations, and they tell about the power of the Gospel and the spread of Christianity, by pointing to this and to that professedly Christian sovereign and despot. But where, again I inquire, has true Christianity obtained a foothold? Do you point to England or to the United States? I grant you have your established church in England, with your prayer-books, and creeds and catechisms; and the queen and her ministers, and the lords, spiritual and temporal, and the commons, with the people, unite in mumbling over these prayers and reciting these creeds and catechisms; and they have their fast days, and keep their new moons, lents and sabbaths; and they read their bibles and sing psalms and hymns, and talk of heaven and hell, and exult in God's plan of salvation and damnation. I grant they build synagogues, cathedrals and churches, and expend millions upon millions upon them; and they have their Bible, and tract, and missionary societies, etc. But what then? What is the result of all this national mummery?

Look at England at home. What is the condition of her poor? Where, kings, queens, lords, spiritual and temporal, and com-

mons, where is your brother? Expending money enough upon your churches, and religious establishments, and bishops and priests to feed all the hungry, clothe all the naked, and educate all the ignorant in the kingdom, hundreds of thousands are perishing annually for bread. Your proud metropolis is annually driving thousands upon thousands of your poverty-stricken females to purchase their bread by a sale of their virtue; and your bishops, priests and laity stand ready to take advantage of their sharp necessities. With a revenue of hundreds of millions per annum, the Church of England supports her bishops and spiritual lords in idleness, and enables them to wallow in luxury, and revel in vice, dissipation and crime, while she robs the hungry, toiling, perishing poor to raise the enormous sum, and thus manifests her Christianity, not only by neglecting but by absolutely robbing the poor.

Look at the wealth of the Christianity of England; see that nation maintaining a queen and royal family at an expense sufficient to carry relief to every hearth in the kingdom. Look at their individual wealth squandered in luxury and dissipation. Look at their princely Christianity and squalid poverty side by side, and then tell me the worth of such a religion. Why are not the hungry fed, the naked clothed, and the ignorant educated? Because the Christianity of England has not the means, or because she has not the heart? The religion of England, in this respect, is no better than Mohammedanism. They might as well have the Koran, the Shaster, or the Sacred Vedas for their religious books as the Bible and their prayer-books.

But look at another outbirth of English Christianity. See her army and navy on every land, and in every ocean and sea, armed with the implements of death. She expends money enough annually in supporting her army and navy, and carrying on the accursed system of war and bloodshed, to bestow a competence upon all her perishing sons and daughters; she expends money enough yearly upon that system to send the Gospel to every dark and benighted son of Adam. But her Gospel is carried on board her men-of-war, and is proclaimed by the discharge of her cannon, in the whizzing of her congreve-rockets and the explosion of her bombs; is enforced at the point of her bayonets and by

the edge of her swords; and its influence is seen in the burning and sacking of towns, villages and cities, in the deadly strife, and in the heaps of the mangled carcasses of the dead; it is heard in the roaring of her cannon, the rattling of her musketry, the clashing of swords; in the groans of the dying and the wailings of the newly-made widows and orphans; and it is felt in the souls of those who mourn in mute despair, because he who was to have been the staff of feeble old age, whose voice was to cheer, whose arm was to support, and whose hand was to lead them, has fallen a victim to the Christianity of Christian England!

How many centuries more must this kind of Christianity prevail in England before it will become a Gospel for the poor? How long, under such religious instructions and Christian influences, will it be before their "swords will be beaten into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks?" What progress has it made toward the accomplishment of that object for the last thousand years? and what new light does the English Church want, or does she expect, by which she will be better able to understand those Christian truths and principles which are to develop and establish that glorious day, when "nations shall learn war no more?" It is not light and knowledge the Church so much needs, as true Christian love. They lack not enlightened heads but converted hearts. They can perceive the force and beauty of Christian truth, but their selfish, lustful, worldly-minded hearts loathe and despise it; and they have got up an admirable plan of salvation, whereby they hope to be saved by the merits of another, and not by their own. No other plan would be suited to their condition, and well may they spend their time, money and breath in extolling the wisdom, beauty and mystery of such a plan, and linger around the tomb with their ointments and spices to embalm the cast-off body long after the animating spirit had left it; and they need another angel to come down and tell them to be no longer seeking the living among the dead.

How do the principles of pure Christianity flourish in the United States of America? this land said to be emphatically a land of bibles, and of Gospel light and liberty—a land pre-eminent for the vigor and purity of its Christianity—a land where

you can scarcely get out of sight of steeples, or out of the hearing of church-bells—a land of Sabbaths and sanctuary privileges! If Christianity has not made its impress upon the national character in the United States, where lies the fault? We have our thirty thousand ministers with their church organizations, extending their influence and power into every nook and corner of the country. They have the control of our schools and colleges, and thus have the training of our children and youth. One day in seven is set apart for religious instruction, and they are our teachers. They have access to the public ear and the public conscience. If Christianity is not taught in its purity in the United States, where lies the fault? If it does not bring forth the promised fruits in the individual and national character, when and where are we to look for it under such teachers?

In the United States, as in England, it is no part of popular Christianity to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, educate the ignorant and redeem the fallen; here, as in England, wealthy Christianity and squalid poverty exist together side by side, year after year; here, as in England, there is more strife in the Church to see who shall build the most fashionable and costly building, erect the highest steeple, and adorn the inside with all that can excite the pride and flatter the vanity, than there is to see who shall look most faithfully and efficiently after the wants of the poor and perishing within their borders. In this country, as in England, there is money enough unnecessarily lavished upon churches to educate all the ignorant, feed all the hungry, and clothe all the naked, and what does it all amount to in the way of producing Christian character? Let our national conduct and character first answer. Look upon the millions upon millions this professedly Christian government annually expends in building forts and arsenals, in building and keeping afloat a navy, in manufacturing cannon, muskets, swords and other implements of death; in keeping up a standing army, and supporting a set of idle and dissipated officers. What care they for the command, "Put up the sword again into its sheath?" What believe they in the doctrine, "They that take the sword shall perish by it?"

But look at another manifestation of the national religion of the United States. Here are among us three millions of men, women and children made chattels by the laws and public sentiment of this Christian nation; three millions of immortal beings, whose business here it is to individualize and develop immortal spirits; whose birth-right it is to investigate, study, improve and develop their minds preparatory to the eternal future upon which they are about to enter; shut out by the laws of the land from the rights and immunities of manhood; denied the privilege of learning to read the volumes of nature or revelation; shut out from the reach of human sympathy; proscribed and hunted like beasts through the land; denied the right of being husbands to their wives, or wives to their husbands, parents to their children, or children to their parents; three millions of human beings doomed to perpetual servitude and bondage, and made the victims of avarice and lust! And it is made a penal offense to give them food, raiment or shelter, even when they are ready to perish! By the laws of these Christian States the husband can be torn from the wife and be doomed to perpetual bondage, and she to ceaseless concubinage; the baby may be plundered from the cradle or torn from the breast of its mother, and sold in the public shambles. The family circle may be invaded, and all the ties of natural affection broken, crushed and trampled upon, and all that avarice can exact, caprice and villainy can inflict, or lust can crave, these three millions are subject to, and there is no arm to protect them, there is no city of refuge within this Christian nation to which they can flee, and no Christian altar to whose horns they can cling and demand protection!

These despised and crushed slaves are abandoned to their fate by the Christianity of the nineteenth century. The pretended commission to go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature, does not include the American slave. The efforts to send missionaries among the heathen, to teach them to read the Bible, etc., can not be made in behalf of the heathen at home. By the laws of the professedly Christian States, there is a wall as high as heaven and deep as hell thrown around them to keep out all light and knowledge. To make human beings

slaves, and to fit them to toil patiently like beasts, humanity must be crushed out of them ; all noble aspirations must be extinguished. And such is the policy pursued by these Christian governments toward these unfortunate beings, and it is their boast that they have so far succeeded in their efforts as to make them contented. To make men and women possessing immortal souls contented to be slaves, is effacing from them the last lineament of the image of their Creator, leaving nothing but the animal in its stead.

The Christian Church can not shift this responsibility to other shoulders. The religion of any country has the making of the public sentiment of the country, and is responsible for it. If that public sentiment is false, it is because the religion in that respect is false. Give me the control of the pulpit, whereby the religious element in man is molded, and I will be responsible for all public vices or national sins. No State or national institution can stand in opposition to the State or national religion. It can not be denied that the Christianity of the United States holds the institution of slavery in its power, and can put an end to it at pleasure if it were disposed to do so ; and the only reason why that most accursed of all institutions still continues among us, is because the religion of the country wills it. That this is so can be proved by the conduct of the churches in all their movements, as such, in their conventions, assemblies, conferences, synods, etc., by their doctors of divinity, ministers and lay members.

Where stood the Church in the nineteenth hundred years of her age, at the commencement of the anti-slavery effort twenty years ago ? What had the Church been about for half a century previous to that time, that she had not learned of the existence and wickedness of slavery in these United States ? What were her thirty thousand watchmen doing on the walls of this Christian Zion ? The cry of the perishing and crushed slave had been ringing through the land for more than fifty years ; they had been in a perishing condition, physically, intellectually, morally and religiously, and the Church knew it ; and during all that time there had not been vitality enough in the Church to have her sympathies enlisted in their behalf. They had not been remembered in their public or private devotions, neither in their alms

or their prayers. The Church was not the friend of the slave, nor by all the virtues of her Christianity was she prepared to be the friend of the slave; consequently, when a true Christian spirit began to be awakened in their behalf, the Church was found in the ranks of the enemy. The clergy, almost with one accord, denounced the agitation of the subject. The doors of their houses were closed against those who would open their mouths for the dumb, and reach forth their hands to assist the fallen. She would not advocate the cause of the oppressed, nor permit others to do it where she had power to prevent. She even went so far, in many instances, as to thrust out of her bosom those who espoused the cause of the slave. Now why was this? Did she not understand the true spirit of Christianity as well then as now? Had she not bibles, and ministers and Sabbaths, and revivals of religion previous to that time?

But the Church has not yet come up to the work. It is yet a debated question whether slavery is not an institution of heaven ordained of God; whether it is not an elder brother of Christianity. The most able and enthusiastic defenders of that institution belong to the Church. Who but a modern doctor of divinity would have thought of absolving the Church from all responsibility for the continuance of slavery in her bosom, on the plea that it was an *organic sin*? Who but a learned professor of modern Christian theology would have come to the rescue of Daniel Webster when he had forfeited all claim to respect, and rendered himself odious in the sight of humanity throughout the world, by his base treachery to freedom and servile truckling and subserviency to slavery, in advocating and sustaining the most infamous act of despotism that ever disgraced the reign of any tyrant or despot? After all the light which has been elicited by twenty years' discussion, has the Church vitality enough to thrust slavery out of her own bosom?

On the subject of slavery the Church is now behind the humanity of the age, and what she has done for the slave she has not done in virtue of her Christian principle. Every step she has taken she has been forced to take by the power of a public sentiment which the humanity of the world, and not the Christianity of the Church, has awakened. There is not an instance to be

found where public sentiment has not been ahead of the church. All these things tend to prove that the humanity of the world is superior to the Christianity of the Church; and taking the past and present as a type of the future, slavery and Christianity will exist harmoniously together for eighteen hundred years to come. There is not that in the Christianity of the nineteenth century which antagonizes with slavery, or war, or any other national sin; and this being the case, when and by what power is war and slavery to cease? How is this Christianity, of which our present churches are types, to fulfill the prophetic song of "Peace on earth and good will among men?" How and when is it to open the prison doors, or break off the bonds of oppression, and let the oppressed go free? Is it answered, when the world is converted to Christianity? What is the use of converting the world to such a Christianity as is now exhibited in Christendom, to put an end to war, and slavery, and avarice and lust? Do not our Christians fight? Do we not take our generals, colonels, captains and soldiers from the Church? And do they not fight as bravely and desperately as those taken from the world? Do they not plan a campaign, conduct an attack, point a cannon, elevate a bomb, thrust a bayonet, brandish a sword, fire a city, sack a town, better than the unchristianized savage or unconverted heathen? Do we not send out our reverend chaplains with our invading armies, to invoke the blessings of God upon our battles? Do not our churches rejoice in our victories, and thank God that our enemies have been put to flight at the point of the bayonet or by the edge of the sword? Do we not present the beautiful and sublime spectacle before the heathen world, and before angels and God, of one Christian in hostile and deadly array against another? How, then, is the converting the world to such a Christianity to put an end to war? Since the days of Constantine, Christian men and Christian nations have been as prone to use the sword as Mohammedan or Pagan men and nations; and we might with as much propriety talk of converting the world to Mohammedanism or Paganism to put an end to war, as to hope for that result by converting the world to the present type of Christianity?

How is slavery to be abolished by converting the world to

modern Christianity? Do not a large portion of the members of our orthodox churches, including our bishops, doctors of divinity, ministers and deacons, hold slaves? And do not a large majority of their Christian brethren support them in it, either by their direct or silent influence? Do not our doctors of divinity and professors of theology sanction slavery as a "DIVINE INSTITUTION," or apologize for it as being an "ORGANIC SIN?" Dare your missionary societies or bible societies lay their finger upon that institution? And if, after the light and development of eighteen hundred years, they have not learned to condemn slavery, when will they learn to do it? Watchman, tell us of the night! Again I ask, according to the present type, how and when is modern Christianity to break off the bonds of oppression, and let the oppressed go free? We have more to hope from Mohammedanism as a means of breaking the bonds of oppression, than from such Christianity, for the Koran would never permit the Mussulman to hold his brother in bondage.

How is selfishness and avarice to be overcome by converting the world to the present type of Christianity? What has modern Christianity accomplished, or what is it likely to accomplish, toward that result? Go into the busy, bustling mart, and you will find those who have just arisen from their knees as busily engaged in driving a sharp bargain, trying to circumvent or overreach their neighbor in a trade, as those who perform no such ceremony. Let revivals sweep over the land, prostrating everything which opposes their progress, and when thousands have been gathered into the churches, what has society gained? Is the converted miser any the less a miser? Is the ambitious seeker after fame, or wealth or power any the less such? In short, is the animal selfishness of the convert in any measure removed? I grant you may have changed his speculative creed; you may have given him a more sanctimonious face; you may have given a religious cant or drawl to his voice; you may have filtered his reason, and made him a bigot; you may have made him negatively virtuous, so far as common or open vices are concerned; the fear of hell may keep him from the haunts of dissipation and vice; but it has not uprooted his animal selfishness, and implanted pure, disinterested love in its place; he is

as greedy as ever to drive a sharp bargain; he clings with as much tenacity as ever to his earthly treasures, and the hand of poverty and want is still stretched out to him in vain for relief. Do the churches of this city look after the poor, even among their Christian brothers and sisters? I challenge them to answer. I know whereof I affirm. While members of our orthodox churches are wallowing in wealth and luxury, clothing themselves in purple and fine linen, and faring sumptuously every day; and while the church has a large poor fund on hand, there are poor widows and orphans, members of those churches, pining in want and destitution; and when wealthy members have been notified of their suffering condition and asked to contribute to their relief, they have proposed to put them upon the town, and thus cast upon the political officers of the city the duties which more properly belonged to the deacons of the Church. What has the world to expect from such a Christianity? In what respect are the poor to be benefited by such a religion? What effect has it upon the proud, the ambitious, the selfish and worldly-minded? Go from the bustling mart to the fashionable church, and what do you find there? Look in upon them; listen to the rustling of silks; witness the gorgeous display of wealth and fashion, and snuff the odors of the fashionable perfume shop, and tell where else upon earth you can find another such an exhibition of vanity, and pride and superciliousness? And yet these churches claim to be the embodiment of true religion, and represent what is to be the effect of Christianity upon the world; that when all are converted like themselves the millennium will come!

From considerations like the foregoing, we are forced to conclude that such a Christianity as is manifested in England and the United States can never become efficient for the redemption of the world. Either modern Christendom is false to Christianity, or Christianity is false to truth, humanity and God. But real Christianity is true. Its philosophy is the philosophy of the universe. Upon its principles was everything made that was made; by obedience to its truths the world must and will be redeemed. But before this can be done, Christianity must be wrested from the keeping of these religious worldlings. They have, by their organizations, taken possession of all the religious institutions,

and made them their own ; they have taken possession of the religious element in community, and converted it to their own use ; they have taken control of public sentiment, and brought it to their support, and wo to the man who will presume to resist their demands ; they have obtained the control of our schools and colleges, and thus brought their influence to bear with almost controlless power upon our children and youth, our middle-aged and old ; they have brought down the demands of a religious life to the tests and habits of fashionable life, and thus united their power with the wealth and fashion of the world, and brought to their support every powerful element in society, and to what purpose ? To support an idle and proscriptive priesthood.

The falsity of modern Christianity may be inferred from its fruits. Truth and virtue are harmonious, and tend to unity. All truths in the universe of God are consistent with each other, and all virtues exist together in harmonious relationship. Tried by this standard, there is much falsehood and vice in modern Christianity. It must strike the mind of every impartial observer that the tendency of all the various sects in Christendom is to division and disunity ; and this tendency has been manifested for the last eighteen hundred years. Who ever heard of two different Christian sects uniting and becoming one ? And where is the one (save the Romish Church) which has existed for any length of time, which has not divided and become two ? And where is this division to cease ? What power is to break down all this thousand sectarian differences and unite them into one ? No power short of that which shall be able to wrest Christianity from their keeping ; which shall be able to withdraw from them the Sabbath and the religious institutions of the land ; which shall be able to drive them from the control of our schools and our colleges ; which shall be able to get control of the religious element in man, and make it true to his nature and destiny. A power to do this must come from the Spirit-world. It must come from the land about which these sectarians assume to teach, and it must come clothed with such power and authority that man can not be deaf to its appeals. Man must be made to feel and know his relation to the future and to God.

Is it answered, we have already sufficient light on this subject; that our relations to the future, and our duties growing out of those relations, are as plain as they can be? Where, I ask, shall I go to find that light? To which of the thousand sects in Christendom shall I look for a revelation of the truth? Shall I go to the Church of Rome and bow before the authority of the Pope, and by my faith doom all Protestants to hell? Or shall I turn my back upon that mother of harlots, and doom millions of zealous Catholics to the same place? And becoming Protestant, to which of the multitudinous sects shall I attach myself? What sign shall I have by which I may know I am right, or in the right path?

Am I answered, "Read the Bible?" Do not all read the Bible? Have not all the thousand divisions in Christendom arisen from reading the Bible? And does not each sect read it right, and every other sect read it wrong? Have not the churches been reading the Bible for the last eighteen hundred years, and have they not educated hundreds of thousands of men, and hired them to make it the business of their lives to study the Bible, and teach them what it means? And have they not paid them thousands of millions of dollars for their instruction, which has resulted in these endless divisions and dissensions? And have these endless Bible readers been able to satisfy themselves that the Old Testament teaches the immortality of the soul, or the New Testament teaches what is to be its condition immediately after death? If we have sufficient light upon this subject, what is the occasion of such infinite misunderstandings? And where is the prospect that these misunderstandings are to cease, under the degree of light and knowledge we have hitherto possessed? Were all our previous Bible readers dishonest, or were they fools, that they were not able to harmonize among themselves? There must be either lack of light or lack of honesty.

These endless divisions and contentions in Christendom have discredited Christianity in the sight of the world, and, united with the false and hypocritical conduct of these Bible readers, have been fast driving the world into Atheism. The tendency of their conduct and influence for the last thousand years has been to stifle the voice of nature in her silent and truthful teachings

as to the immortality of the soul, the existence of a God and the realities of an endless future; to prostitute and pervert the religious element in man by crushing reason, and substituting blind authority in its stead; and whatever may have been their professed creed, they have been, in their lives and conduct, practical atheists. Their influence in society has been atheistical, and tended more in that direction than to prove the truth of what they professed to believe and teach. It can not be denied that the tendency of the age has been, under the instruction of these religious teachers and Bible expounders, in the direction of materialism. The scientific minds of the day have not confidence enough in the religion of these churches to be arrested by them in their onward course to atheism.

And why should they have confidence in them? What evidence have they furnished the world of their honesty and sincerity? Professing to believe and teach that we should not "lay up for ourselves treasures upon earth," they are constantly laboring night and day for that object, and sometimes violating every principle of moral honesty, and robbing the poor to accumulate for themselves earthly treasures; professing to believe and teach that they are steward's of God's household; and whatever they possess they hold in trust for God's use, to be expended in feeding his hungry, clothing his naked, and educating his ignorant children, and that whatever they do unto the least of these poor suffering children of sorrow, they do unto Christ himself, and that wherein they neglect and despise them they neglect and despise Christ—yet they wallow in wealth and luxury, totally indifferent to the fate of the needy and perishing about them. Professing to believe that man should not resist evil by evil, they individually and collectively arm themselves with the implements of death, and rush upon their brethren, lay waste their fields, burn their cities, sack their towns, and butcher them and their wives and children. They profess to believe that Christianity is designed to break the bands of oppression and let the oppressed go free; yet they are holding millions of their brethren and sisters in chattel slavery, and claiming IT to be a divine institution. They have opposed progress in scientific discoveries, by denouncing every important advance which has

been made as infidel and the work of the devil, and they have persecuted and proscribed almost every one who has been instrumental in developing any new truth. The sciences of astronomy, of geology, of philosophy, phrenology, mesmerism, etc., etc., have had to pass under the ban of their proscription. How, then, I inquire, can the world have confidence in them? False to everything they profess—false to truth, to humanity and God!

Is it not time that power should be wrested from such hands? Is it not time that light should break in upon us from the Spirit-land? Is it not time that a voice should come from beyond the grave to re-assure us of our own immortality, and that God lives and is true, though all sects in this sectarian world be false? Is it not time for God to vindicate his character and attributes from the aspersions of modern Christianity. If man is ever to be redeemed from the dominion of selfishness, and the vices and crimes incident to it, must not a new light spring up; must not new revelations be made, or old ones be re-affirmed and established? If there is power in the Spirit-world to communicate with man and re-establish him in the realities of the future and of God, never was there a time when he needed its exercise more than now. The voice of suffering humanity throughout the world, is going up to heaven for relief. The cries of the needy and perishing are borne on every breeze. War and slavery and avarice are intent on devouring the poor and the weak, and they appeal to the Church for relief. Humanity calls upon the Church to come to their aid. But like Cain of old, she inquires, "Am I my brother's keeper?" and priest and Levite-like, passes by on the other side.

The world can never be redeemed until the religious element in man is properly developed and directed. True religion is the spontaneous production of the elements of our spiritual being, and is innate in man. Without these elements, religion would be nothing; with them it is everything. It is not for God; it is not what God needs; it is not what he desires on his own account; it is not for his use. Being infinite in the perfection of his attributes, nothing that man can do will add to or detract from those perfections. He can not be made more powerful, wise, good and happy, by anything or everything which man

can do; and aside from the influence which truth or falsehood, obedience or disobedience, are to have on beings out of himself, it is a matter of indifference to him whether men keep his laws or violate them. Religion has to do with man and the relation he sustains to God. Man, as an immortal being, has to do with the individualization and development of his own immortal spirit, and the individualization and development of immortal Spirits about him, and he is so inwoven into the web of existence, that he can neither act nor think without influencing the destiny of beings around him, and the great system of which he is a part is so constructed that his own eternal well-being is in harmony with the eternal well-being of every other existence, and can only be promoted by promoting the well-being of others. Now it is the business of religion to make man acquainted with his nature and destiny, and with the relations he sustains through that nature to his fellow-man and to God, and to induce in him the necessary impulses to move in the sphere of his duty and destiny. Hence all our religious duties have relation to ourselves and God, and can only be performed by bringing ourselves into harmony with all truths and virtues. We can not love God and hate a brother; we can not serve God and despise a brother; we can not serve God and neglect a brother; our relation is such that whatever we do to man we do to God.

And herein is a fundamental error in modern Christianity. Practically, they make religious service to consist in doing something they owe to God, irrespective of man; doing something that shall please God, regardless of its relation to, and effect upon, man, believing in something that God requires, although it be mysterious and incomprehensible. Hence a very prominent part of modern Christianity consists in speculative creeds that tax somewhat the faith of those who subscribe to them; and the great virtue in believing in such creeds consists in the tax such faith imposes on credulity, thereby evincing faith or confidence in the truth of God, although he require us to believe those things which are apparently inconsistent or absurd. Another very prominent feature of modern Christianity is, that worship consists in observing certain religious forms and ceremonies, because they suppose God requires them to observe them; but for

what reason God ever required them, or why he now requires them, they are unable to divine. They can not see that those forms and ceremonies are particularly beneficial to God or man, yet nevertheless they must be observed as a matter of form, and by such observance they worship and please God.

Another fundamental error of Christianity is in mistaking the *end* and *aim* of religion. They speak of it as designed to fit us for death, when in reality we do not need it for that purpose. Religion is needed to fit man to live, and is more imperatively demanded for the purpose of fitting man to live than for preparing him to die. The true man will have no trouble about dying. He will have no fears that he can die well enough. His great anxiety will be to know how to live to the best purpose. True religion will teach him how to do this. Modern Christians act upon the hypothesis that God is angry with them, and intends to damn them eternally hereafter, and that religion is designed to teach them how they can appease his anger, make him pleased with them, and thereby enable them to escape eternal damnation; hence they seek what they call religion, and urge others to do the same, as a sort of insurance against a future hell. Now I hardly need remark that the utmost scope of such religious views is only to make men negatively virtuous, not positively and actively so. Such a religion may make civil men and civil women, but it will never make good and true men and women. I shall consider this matter more at length hereafter.

Thus it is that the religious element in man has been perverted, and its power as a means of human redemption has been destroyed. Christianity, the only true system of religion, has been robbed of its original significance and power; it has been plundered of those divine truths by which the world was to be redeemed and reconciled to God. As taught and practiced by its divine founders it was pure Spiritualism. Its worship consisted in perfect obedience to all the requirements of truth and justice, prompted by an interior love for the true and the just, and was without form and ceremony. It had no set time, no place or circumstance, but it belonged to all times, all places and all circumstances. It was unnecessary to go to Jerusalem or to Mount Gerizim to worship the Father. He could be worshiped at the

well, on the mountain, or in the desert. Wherever there was an ignorant being to be instructed, a fallen being to be raised up, a mourning one to be comforted or a suffering one to be relieved, there was an altar whereon a pure sacrifice could be offered most acceptable to God. Christ, in his life and teachings, was the Word of God made flesh; that is, he was the translation of the infinite Father into finite humanity. He came to reveal those principles and truths which were interwoven into the very structure of the universe, and to become an exemplification of those principles and truths in their practical application to man as a social and civil being.

The end, aim and true scope of religion as taught by Christ, being misunderstood and misapplied by modern Christians, and a mechanical, artificial system, having more of formal Judaism than spiritual Christianity in it, having taken the place of the true one, modern Christianity has become as false and idolatrous in its teachings and worship as other Paganisms; and it is not easy to determine whether it is Christianized heathenism or heathenized Christianity; but be it what it may, it is so far from being true, it can not be relied upon as a means of human redemption.

Of this mankind have been satisfied for a long time, and have ceased looking to it as a means of reform. If an attack is to be made upon any form of vice with a view of rendering it odious, and thus banishing it from society, an organization out of the Church must be formed for that purpose. If we rely upon the Church to do the work, it is not done. Intemperance and the Church moved along together for centuries, and would have continued to do so, had not an influence exterior to that body organized and put forth a systematic opposition to it; and so was it with slavery. There is nothing in modern Christianity which revealed slavery in a sinful or odious light, until the humanitarian on the outside of Church organization and discipline raised his voice against it, and then the first he aroused in the ranks of the enemy was the Church and its ministry. The first battle had to be fought with them, and they have not capitulated yet; for they are now debating whether slavery is not a Christian institution, at least in harmony with Christianity, and how long it

will take them to settle that question time alone can determine. So also with war, which has so long deluged the earth with blood. It has been the champion of the Church for the last fifteen hundred years, and modern Christianity has yet to learn that the trade of the soldier and the profession of the Christian are incompatible with each other. And so is it with every other popular vice. Every effort at reform originates in, and is carried forward outside of, the Church, and it has ceased to be considered an instrument of reform, and the churches have ceased considering themselves as such.

PROPOSITION.

MAN the immortal, possessing the embryonic conditions suited to the perception of all truth, and the affections of all relations in the universe must be a microcosm of the universe.

Hence man must find revealed in himself the unit, the unity of the universe, and must learn of the conditions, relations and laws of the universe as he finds them thus revealed.

Hence man must possess the elements of all truth and all affection within his spiritual individuality.

Hence whatever there is of heaven, earth and hell in the universe, its representative condition, relation and law must exist in the unit man.

WE are happy to say to our readers that we have secured a most valuable correspondent for our Monthly in the person of Miss Whitcomb, of Hancock, N. H. She is an inspired writer, and whatever comes from her pen will be found to be pregnant with spiritual and divine truth. We expect articles from her pen monthly; and we would say to our readers, "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches."

EFFECTS OF LAND MONOPOLY UPON LABOR.

NECESSITY is above all conventional law, and is that condition which nature has imposed upon all sentient existences. If the Author of all existence has given man a being upon the earth, and from his physical constitution has made him subject to certain necessities to develop and perpetuate that existence, he has furnished those means necessary to supply the demands of his physical necessities, and has given him a title to them as inalienable as his own existence. The Almighty has not created man, and by the very constitution of his being compelled him to walk upon the earth, and to derive his physical subsistence from her bosom, without giving him an inalienable right to walk upon the earth, and to have access to her bosom to supply his necessities; and he has delegated no authority to any being or number of beings to come between a man and his right to walk and dig the earth.

This right to stand upon the earth and have access to her bosom is an appurtenance to man's existence; and he derives it with his title to his life; and he holds it by as high a tenure as he holds his life; and no power that is not invested with the authority to deprive him of the one can have authority to deprive him of the other. He holds this right in common with every human being existing upon the earth; he holds it to the exclusion of no one, and no one holds it to the exclusion of him. His right to walk upon, and have access to, the bosom of the earth, is a fundamental right, without which all other rights are worthless. He has a right to enjoy the light of heaven, to breathe her pure atmosphere and be fanned by her refreshing breezes; he has a right to be baptized by her dews and rains, and drink of her fountains; but these rights he holds in common, to the exclusion of none, and none to the exclusion of him.

The reason why man can acquire no property in the soil *per se*, to the exclusion of any other being, is the same as that he can acquire no property in the sun-light, in the atmosphere, or in the rains and dews of heaven, to the exclusion of all other beings. All men, by virtue of their existence upon the earth, and by virtue of the necessities of their being, have certain rights which are only limited by the common rights of all, and these common rights never clash nor interfere with each other; and the moment we hear of men's rights clashing with each other, that moment we may be assured that some are claiming that which does not belong to them. This earth, with its land and seas and fountains; with its atmosphere and sun-light, its dews and rains, depend not upon the labor of man for their existence, although they are absolutely indispensable to the existence of man, individually and collectively; therefore they can not become the exclusive property of any, but must belong to all in common.

The reasons why they can not become the exclusive property of any are, first, man's physical necessities do not require the existence of any such right; second, to admit any such right, brings man into a state of antagonism with the equal rights of others, which antagonism prevails only where the laws of nature are violated; and third, there is no way of acquiring title to this common property of the race, short of getting our title-deeds from God himself; and he never gives title to that which the nature and necessities of our being do not require, and with our being he does give title to that which they do require.

Under the first proposition, that man's physical necessities do not require that he should have an absolute property in that which nature has provided for his use without his care or labor, little need be said. He only needs the use of so much land, and air, and sun-light and water as the necessities of his physical being require for its development and preservation; so much he is entitled to, and he may use as much more as he can, provided he does not interfere with the equal rights and necessities of others, and only upon those conditions. Upon the second proposition more may be said. When we admit that man may become the absolute owner of the earth, the air, the sun-light and the

water, we have admitted away our right to exist upon the earth; for if man can acquire an absolute, exclusive right or property in one foot of earth, exclusive of his ability to use it, he can, upon the same principle, acquire title to every foot of earth, exclusive of the rights of every human being; and upon that principle, if he can command the power, he can bring the whole race of man into a state of vassalage to himself, living only by his permission.

This proposition demands attentive consideration. If I, regardless of my own necessities, and of my ability to occupy and use any portion of the soil to which I now refer, can properly acquire an exclusive property in one hundred acres of land, so that I can say to every other being, 'Touch it at your peril, even to save you from physical death, I have a right, upon the same principle, to acquire an exclusive title to all the land in the state, the nation and the world, and to say to every other being, Your very existence is a trespass upon my rights; you are treading upon my land; you are drinking of my fountains; you are breathing my atmosphere; you are standing in my sun-light; you have no business upon my earth—therefore die, and die in my debt for the air you have breathed, for the water you have drank, for the land you have trod upon, and for that upon which you hope to be buried.

Such is the consequence of admitting that man can acquire an absolute property in that which nature has provided for the use of the race without the care and labor of man, and such is the practical working of the present system of buying and selling land throughout the world. Let the soil be free as the air we breathe, the water we drink and the light of heaven, and man will be free as the soil; let no one get between him and the bosom of his mother earth, and he can not be crushed. Put an end to buying and selling the land, and the world is emancipated. The monopolist can no longer control the labor of the poor man. If he will not pay just wages, the laborer can make his appeal to mother earth, and she will respond to his call; the oak will yield him her acorns, and the earth her roots; the cow will yield him her milk, and the sheep its fleece, and the wild beasts their skins; but get between him and the common mother

of all, and you leave him at the mercy of capital that has no soul or sympathy; you have cut off his retreat; you have silenced his appeal. Therefore I say under the second proposition, that man can not acquire title to the bosom of mother earth to the exclusion of his fellow man.

Our third proposition is, that there is no one from whom man can acquire title to the soil to hold it to the exclusion of others, short of God himself; and he can not get it from God, because our common Father gives us title to no more of his works than our natures and necessities demand. If we get any more we must work for it, and so work as not to interfere with the equal rights of the rest of his children. It must be obvious to every one that by nature one man has as good a right to the soil as another. By nature one man has as much property in the soil as another; and hence, by nature having equal rights in the soil, they individually have a common right; and that common right is such that there can be no conflict when properly observed. Now each having an equal right in the soil, can not be deprived of that right by any or all other beings. The right is incident to his existence, and can only end with his existence; and the right being incident to his existence, can never be destroyed by less authority than that which has a right to his existence. Now, as one man has no right to the existence of another as his property, no man has authority to deprive another of his right in the soil; and as governments have only such authority as the individuals composing the government possess, and can and do give to them, governments have no authority to deprive an individual of his rights in the soil.

The conclusion is inevitable, that no authority can deprive men of their right to use so much of the soil as their physical necessities, and the physical necessities of those dependent upon them demand; and if they are deprived of the exercise of that right, it is the law of force, and not of justice and right, that thus deprives them. Their right still exists, although their power to exercise it may be taken away; and whoever seeks to deprive them of the exercise of that right, in principle is a robber, and seeks to deprive them of their existence. Those who, in principle or practice, sustain the present system of buying, selling and

monopolizing the soil, are in rebellion against the laws of nature, the rights of man, and the government of God; and although it might be considered a crime against society as at present constituted, for man to disregard the pretended titles of these land monopolists, and set up his claim to his unalienated right to use the land they have monopolized and do not use, it would be no crime against the laws of nature, the principles of justice, the rights of man or the government of God. He would only be asserting a right which God had given him, and which is withheld by fraud and force; a right he can as justly and properly exercise as the poor chattel slave can use his eyes to see, and his limbs to follow the path that leads him to freedom.

The practice of monopolizing the soil by governments and individuals, and thus excluding men from exercising their right to make their last appeal to their common mother, earth, originated in, and is based upon, the principle that *might* makes right, and that practice is continued upon the same principle; and whatever may be the *theory* of that government which thus monopolizes the soil and claims the authority to dispose of it to whomsoever she chooses, giving to them an exclusive property in it, in practice and in principle she is a despotism, and unworthy the confidence and support of true men; and whatever may be the name and theory of a party, who by its own chosen and continued exponents in the state or national councils, refuse to relinquish their claim to thus monopolize the soil, that party is despotic in its principles, and is an enemy of the people, and should be dispossessed of all political power.

The history of the origin of this practice of monopolizing the soil by government, demonstrates that it originated in *might*, and the very term still used in conveying title to land, refers to the feudalism or slavery of man under such a system. In early times, when the sovereign of a country, in the person of some tyrant or despot, sent his invading army to overrun and conquer another people, being successful, he farmed out their country, granting the right to use and control the soil to certain individuals, on condition that they yielded him certain services or paid him certain amounts of money from time to time. The sovereign was considered the absolute lord of the soil, and those hold-

ing under grants from him were said to hold them in *seif, feud or fee*; that is, they, as the servants or slaves of the sovereign, held their title to the soil on condition of rendering him service or money as a fee for the right thus to occupy it. As the sovereign could not deal directly with all the people, he granted out large tracts of land to certain individuals, making them sub-lords of those tracts; and hence arose the order of noblemen or lords, owning and controlling large counties of land, which they again farmed out to the people on similar conditions that they had received them from their sovereign, and by means of which they were enabled to fulfill their engagements with their sovereign. These noblemen or lords, not being able to deal with all the people in their counties, farmed out their lands in large tracts of boroughs or townships to another class of lesser lords, who again farmed out their townships to the people at large; hence arose the relation of landlord and tenant.

Thus the land of the country was farmed out, from the sovereign down to the serf, and the last and humblest class of renters were those who worked the soil, and by whose sweat and toil all above them were supported. The sovereign performed no labor, although he commanded his millions and wallowed in wealth and luxury; the nobleman performed no labor, although he received the wages of ten thousand men; the landlord performed no labor, although thousands were tributary to him; none but the humble tenant and artizan labored to support themselves, landlord, nobleman and sovereign. The whole burden of supporting the kingdom, and all the wealth, extravagance and luxury of kings, priests, noblemen, landlords and idlers rested on the shoulders of these humble laborers. They could have access to the soil only on condition of rendering this service or fee, and thus this system of monopolizing the soil was made the foundation of throwing upon the shoulders of the poor laborer the burden of supporting all the rest. Had the soil been free; had no sovereign, nobleman or landlord come between man and the bosom of mother earth, he could have secured to himself and family the fruit of his labor; but as it was, he was obliged to support the insolent landlord, the haughty nobleman and the op-

pressive sovereign, before he could have the privilege of supporting himself and family.

This same system continues in principle in this country, and its practical workings are the same. The government comes between the laborer and the soil, and will not permit him to occupy it except upon condition of paying to them a fee; and when she conveys any portion of it she conveys it in fee, that is, upon condition that the laborer continue to pay a fee or tax upon it; and by this system she excludes the poor man from the right to stand upon God's earth, and breathe God's air; by this system she makes him a serf or slave to wealth and capital, and thus, by instituting a system of wages—slavery, crushes the bodies and souls of tens of thousands. It is by this system of monopolizing the soil that the poor laborer is compelled to support the government, to support the aristocratic classes in their haughtiness, and wealth and luxury, to support all the idlers and vagabonds in community, and what is left, if anything, after doing this, he may call his own, and himself and family may be despised in the meagerness of it.

Look at the practical workings of this system in this city (Cleveland), which is a fair illustration of the principle involved in the system. Mr. A, B and C came to this place in an early day, and purchased the right to control the soil upon which this city is now situated. By nature it was admirably calculated to become the site of a large and flourishing city. They purchased the land for a few shillings per acre, not to occupy and use themselves, but to farm out to those who should afterward wish to use and improve it. They bestowed no labor upon it; they put no property in it; they merely kept everybody off, except upon condition they would pay them a heavy fee for the privilege of occupying it. Thus they have continued their monopoly, until their land, from being estimated at only a few shillings per acre, is now estimated by its hundreds and thousands and tens of thousands of dollars, and each acre yields them more money than the poor laborer has been enabled to accumulate during his lifetime of sweat and toil and frugality; and these men who have never soiled their fingers with labor are now rolling in wealth.

and luxury, have waxed fat and kick at the poor laborer; they treat him as a slave, as he is, and when he approaches them he must take off his hat and bow down his head, and whisper low and humble words in a bondman's key. And how has this state of things been brought about? By the labor of the wealthy and purse-proud nobleman? By any value he has contributed to the soil? By any sweat of his which has enriched it? No! He has done nothing but live on the labor of others during all this time; he has been riding in his carriage, having servants under him, saying to this man, "Go, and he goeth, and to another, come, and he cometh, and to another, do this, and he doeth it."

This land has been made valuable by the sweat and toil of the humble laborer, who by his hard earnings has accumulated a few dollars, by which he has been enabled to purchase a few square feet, and by still further labor has been enabled to erect him a house to shelter himself and family. Thus one after another have gathered in until a little city has sprung up, each one buying the right to stand upon a small portion of the earth and erect him a shelter, or leasing the right to occupy one already erected. By this congregation of laborers and consumers, all sorts of speculators have been attracted hither to buy their labor, and fleece and pluck them like sheep and geese. This has increased the demand for land on which to erect their stores and shops and dwellings, and this demand has given to this land its present enormous value. Had these industrious laborers never come here to spend their strength and pour out their sweat, the land would now have been worth no more than its value for farming purposes; and should all these laborers leave to-morrow, and no more come here, it would again return to its natural value; so then it is the labor and sweat of these poor working-men and women which have amassed these fortunes for those who now look down upon and despise them; the extravagance and luxury with which they are now able to sport is taken from the hard earnings of the toiling poor. These stately edifices in which they live; the costly furniture which fills and adorns them; the beds of down upon which they sleep; the fine horses which they drive, and the splendid coaches in which they ride, and the broad-

cloths and silks and satins with which they clothe themselves and families, are the product of the unpaid labor of the poor, which they have stealthily, and by the aid of government, been enabled to filch from them, and this explains the reason why the poor laborer must live in a hovel, sit upon a bench, sleep upon straw, feed upon crusts, walk on foot, and clothe himself and family with rags, and for all this service to the rich be footed and spurned.

And all this increase of wealth arising from the enhanced value of this land, only tends so much the more to crush the poor laborer. In the first place, it puts it out of his power to purchase the right to use it as the owner of that right. The amount sufficient to buy him a home is more than he can save from the labor of years; hence, if he live upon it at all he must pay heavy rent month after month, which absorbs what he otherwise might accumulate; and in proportion as the price of the land advances, his rents advance, without increasing his ability to pay them. Again, the merchant must add to the price of his merchandise an amount equivalent to all the profits he wishes to make, together with the exorbitant rent he is obliged to pay upon his store and dwelling, and this additional price must come out of the consumer; and when the poor laborer purchases his goods he must pay a proportion of it. So also with the grocer. The necessities of life, which the poor laborer is obliged to purchase from day to day, are under a tariff to pay this rent. So with the mechanic. He is obliged to remember his rents when he is fixing the price on the articles he manufactures. There is no way of escaping it under the present system. Everything which tends to enhance the value of property in the city is only a means of laying so much the heavier tax upon the laborer. He has it all to pay in the end. The construction of these railroads which have largely enhanced the value of real property in this city, have raised the price of rent tens of thousands of dollars, which is so much additional tax levied upon labor, without rendering an equivalent to the laborer. I have myself paid a tax of twenty-five dollars in the shape of rent, to say nothing of the additional price of provisions; others have done the same. And who reaps the benefit? The land monopolist; he who has lands and

houses to rent and sell. Not the poor laborer who rents; not even the poor mechanic who owns the house he lives in. He has no more than he needs to shelter himself and family; he has no room to rent, no land to sell unless he renders himself homeless.

Thus it is with this system. The laborer is like the convict upon the tread-wheel; his own weight but carries the wheel still faster, and compels him to put forth the more energy to keep from being crushed beneath it; and so this system will continue to work. If you would estimate the enormous tax upon labor arising out of this system, commence and compute the estimated value of the real estate in this city which has been purchased. Commence and measure up Superior street, and multiply the number of feet by two hundred and fifty or three hundred dollars for each side of the street. Measure St. Clair and multiply its length in feet upon each side by seventy or one hundred. Measure Lake street, and multiply its double length in feet by twenty-five, and so on go through all the streets in the city, and compute the enormous amount of the estimated value of the land upon which the city is built. Now whoever purchases this land must pay the money, and that money must not only come from the laborer, but he must continue paying interest upon it in the shape of rent and profits. Look next at the splendid palaces costing their tens of thousands. Those who build them must have some means of raising the money, and that money must come out of the laborer. Look at the manner in which these landlords and traders furnish and maintain those splendid establishments, and feed and clothe themselves and families. That money all comes out of the laborer. Look at the churches and cathedrals springing up on almost every corner of the streets, costing from their five to their fifty thousand dollars each. That money comes out of the laborer. Look at the improvements going on to ornament, beautify and adorn the city, giving rise to a city tax of thousands upon thousands. This also comes out of the laborer. Look at the merchants, and lawyers, and doctors, and priests, and idlers and vagabonds of every kind, who are supported, and all this money comes out of the laborer. Look at your township tax, county tax, state tax and national tax, amounting to millions almost for this single county, and all this

comes out of the laborer; and so I might go on adding item to item, showing the enormous tax that is thrown upon the shoulders of the poor, despised laborer.

Our men of wealth think they have a right to have all these things their own way, because they pay for them. But how do they raise the money to pay for them? That money is raised in the shape of taxes and profits collected off the poor laboring man. They must purchase of the produce, and give him the least possible price for his labor, and then sell to the consumer, and obtain the greatest possible price; and between the price they pay and the price for which they sell there is a wide difference, which goes to defray expenses, and furnish them the means which enable them to build and furnish their houses, and feed and clothe themselves and families, and build churches and court-houses and jails, and pay priests, lawyers, doctors, speculators, idlers, etc. They pay, I grant, but they collect the means to pay from the poor laborer. The poor needle-woman, who works sixteen hours for twenty-five cents, if she could trace the fruit of her labor, would find that she had some stock in those splendid mansions, in those churches, in those velvet cushions and gold-embossed bibles; the poor mechanic and humble artizan would find that, could he follow the fruit of his labor, he might sit in that splendid parlor of his wealthy neighbor, taste of some of those rare delicacies, and ride now and then in those carriages.

The laborer needs to understand that for the dancing of these noblemen he is called upon to pay the fiddler; that the saying is not true that "those who dance must pay the fiddler." It is only when the poor laborer dances, that the dancer pays the music. What though the national government raises the most of its revenue to defray its expenses by a tariff. That comes none the less out of the laboring man. If it levies a tax of twenty-five or fifty per cent on articles imported into this country, and collects it out of the importer in New York, that tax is charged over, and paid by the consumer in Cleveland. The importer does not lose it; the merchant does not pocket the loss; the consumer foots the bill. Every time you purchase an imported article and pay your cash or labor for it, you pay a portion of the tax that goes to pay the President twenty-five thousand dollars a

year, and the heads of the departments their six thousands, and the foreign ministers their nine thousand outfit and nine thousand infit, and nine thousand a year; you pay a portion of the eight dollars a day, and eight dollars for every twenty miles travel; you pay a portion toward building public buildings, the navy, arsenals, forts, etc; you pay for the millions upon millions that are squandered year after year upon pets and sinecures, and Galphin and Goodwin claims. The laborer pays the fiddler for all this governmental dancing.

When these things are considered, is it strange that the laboring men and women are poor, with such a tax constantly pressing upon their shoulders, and as society progresses growing worse and worse? Every step which increases the wealth of the country, is thrusting these producers still lower and lower. Their labor, which is the only true source of wealth, and which only adds to the wealth of the country, is turned against them to crush them; for under the institutions of the country, that labor is under the control of capital, and is owned by it, and thereby made to enrich the capitalist and impoverish the laborer. What though a railroad is constructed to facilitate travel and equalize the price of produce, etc? The capitalist owns it; he reaps the profits. If property is enhanced in value, it is the land monopolist that reaps the benefit, and the poor laborer is taxed to pay for it. If a valuable invention is made, by which labor is saved and workingmen turned out of employ, the capitalist grasps it and pockets the proceeds, and thus everything is turned against the poor laborer. But to hold him to the rack, the government has got between him and the soil, and has placed an angel or a devil, with a flaming sword that turns in all directions, to keep him off, and starve him to the terms of the monopolist.

This is the position of the laboring poor; and they are tending to the condition of poor Ireland. If this country were as densely populated as are England and Ireland, the laboring masses would be in no better condition. The same causes are at work here as there, and unless our policy is changed, will work out the same result. Give the poor English or Irish peasantry access to the soil which belongs to them, and you would have no more of star-

vation; give them their inalienable right to appeal to mother earth, and their prayers for bread would be answered. But the only way to keep them in slavery to the capitalist is to cut off their retreat, to shut them away from the soil, and then there is no alternative left them. They must take such terms as capital dictates to them, live or die.

Such are some of the evils growing out of this system of trading in that which nature never designed to be a subject of commerce; and the disposition thus to monopolize the soil, and make it a subject of speculation and a source of wealth, betrays an utter recklessness of the rights of man; and the man, or party or government which will do it, and thus voluntarily deprive man of that which belongs to him by right divine, must be denounced as too ignorant or too depraved to be entrusted with the management of the interests of society. If they are too ignorant to understand the right of man to the soil by virtue of his very being, and the necessities growing out of that being; if they are too obtuse to perceive the consequences resulting from such a system, they certainly can not be trusted until they become more enlightened. If they are too dishonest and selfish to concede the right when they do understand it, they can not be trusted in any position where the rights of man are liable to be jeopardized by their action. There can be no right more sacred to man than his right to have access to the soil. It is as sacred as his right to life or liberty; and the man who would willfully deprive him of the one, lacks not the principle to deprive him of the other.

Whoever would countenance the system of land monopoly, and resist the right of man to a free and inalienable use of the soil, as a means of supplying his natural necessities, and the necessities of those dependant upon him, would as quick deny to him air to breathe, or water to drink, and would as gladly make merchandize of the one as the other. The man who would drive the crushed and perishing laborer from the soil unless he would buy of him the right to occupy it, would as soon, had he the power, monopolize the air, the light or the water, and see the poor laborer die for want of breath, or grope his way in perpetual darkness for want of light, or famish for want of drink, unless he

was able to cash up for every breath of air, or for every ray of light, or for every swallow of water; and the one would be as right, as honest and just as the other.

Our position, then, is this: The soil is free for the use of man, and can not become the subject of property; and no man has any right to claim any more of it than he can actually use or occupy. He can claim no right except to that upon which he has bestowed labor; and in such cases, the value of the labor thus beneficially bestowed upon it is the true measure of his interest therein. That man's right to the free, uninterrupted use of the soil is as inalienable as his right to breathe the air, or drink the water, or as his right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that the right being inalienable in him, he can not be deprived of it by man, either in his individual or governmental capacity; that these natural rights are above all law of human enactment, and man, at all times, in all places, and under all circumstances, by the charter of Almighty God, is authorized to assert them.

Our position further is, that so long as this system of land monopoly prevails, nothing can protect labor from the oppression of capital, no system of social reform can prevail, and that instead of elevating and improving the condition of the laboring masses, every step we take in advance is but plunging them lower and lower in their state of dependence and degradation. The external prosperity of any town, city, state or nation, will be a certain indication of the sinking down of the poor laborer. The consequence is inevitable. Like the beam of the balance, the elevation of one end is necessarily accompanied by the depression of the other. So the more wealthy and independent you make one class under this system, the poorer and more dependent you make the opposite. For illustration: This city is now considered in a prosperous condition. Property is constantly advancing; there is an increasing demand for rent, and rents are advancing with that demand. The wealthy landholder finds himself getting rich without labor or effort; he has only to open his hand, and money flows into it. The banker finds an increased demand for accommodations; interest is advancing; busi-

ness is advancing. The noise and bustle of the streets is increasing, and everything indicates a state of business prosperity. But now, as to the poor laborer who depends upon his hands for the means of supporting himself and family, how is it with him? He, too, finds that rents are advancing, to his sorrow. The railroad has been no blessing to him; his five shillings rent has now become a dollar; and while his landlord is getting rich out of the advance of rent, he is getting poorer. His provisions are growing dearer from ten to twenty per cent., partly in consequence of this increase of rent in the city. Everything the poor laborer has to buy is demanding more money; everything he has to sell—his labor, to say the best—remains stationary. Thus this system ever has worked, and ever will work.

This system of land monopoly furnishes the best possible means to the wealthy class, thus to levy contributions upon the poor laborer. No other system could plunder the poor like it. So long as man must stand upon the earth; so long as that which shelters him from the wind and the storm must stand upon *terra firma*, so long can that class who get between the masses and the ground they *must* stand upon, and levy rent upon their necessities, oppress and plunder them to the extent of their avaricious desires and cupidity, and there is no way the poor can help themselves short of breaking up the system.

Even the religion of Jesus Christ, which was emphatically a Gospel for the poor, and designed and properly calculated to remedy this evil, has been perverted and turned against the poor laborer. It has married into the family of wealth and fashion; it is as proud, supercilious and oppressive as mammon. I do not mean true Christianity; but I mean that which assumes to be it and which stands in its stead; I mean that mutilated and mangled carcass which only hides its deformity beneath creeds, catechisms, formularies, pride, pomp, display, purple, fine linen, silks and satins; I mean that fashionable Christianity bedecked in tinsels and jewels, and scented with the perfume of the otto of rose, musk, cologne, etc.; I mean that Christianity which can nestle in the truckle-bed of slavery, and war, and speculation; which can wallow in wealth and luxury, and send its poor to the poor-

house lest they should tread upon their soil, stand in their light, get between them and the wind, or make a draught upon their purses.

But land monopoly is only one of the evils under which we are laboring. There are other fundamental errors in our social system to which I shall call your attention; and when these errors are fully exposed, and their practical workings pointed out, then we shall be prepared to understand the remedy to be applied. The evils under which society is laboring result from a violation of the higher law, to which men, individually and collectively, are subject, and from the operations of which they can not escape. Man is above all human institutions; he is as much above them as the Creator is above the creature. "Before men made us citizens, great Nature made us men; and it is as vain, foolish and mad for men to attempt to control the operations of this higher law to which they are subject by their legislative enactments, as it would be to attempt to legislate the quantity of rain that should fall during the year, and the exact time when it should fall, or to attempt to control the movements of the heavenly bodies by their enactments, and determine how much influence the sun should exert upon our earth.

Men can not make laws any more than they can make worlds. Men can not alter or change the operation of a law established. They can throw themselves athwart them as they can throw themselves athwart a railroad track, and be crushed by their natural and just operation, but the penalty of so doing will inevitably be inflicted upon them. Everything which exists, exists under certain principles, which are known as the laws of its existence, and those principles are to that existence superior to every other law. Man, as a sentient, immortal being, is under the dominion of certain principles, which are inherent in, and a part of, his very existence, and those principles constitute the higher law of his nature.

It will be my business, in a future article, to demonstrate the truthfulness of these positions, and show that nearly all our legislation is worse than useless, because, by their enactments, they are almost constantly antagonizing with the operation of some of their higher laws, and compelling men to antagonize with them,

or to violate their human enactments, and thus to become subject to penalties of some sort. Society can never prosper while this state of things exists.

If the absolute sovereignty of the individual was preserved, if man was emancipated from all artificial restraints, we would soon be able to realize the evils of attempting to drive him athwart the operations of this higher law of his being. We should find that human legislation is worse than useless so far as it attempts to control the principles which naturally control the individual and society. We need no legislation on the part of men, because they have no power to legislate. They can not make one hair white or black so far as the higher law is concerned. We need instructors, and our legislative assemblies should be converted into schools of instruction. The business of the legislator is to ascertain what action on our part these higher laws demands, and to publish their discoveries. Beyond that they are of no value.

PROPOSITION.

ALL existence to the mind must be represented in its perceptions and affections; and what is not represented in the perceptions and affections of the mind, has no conscious existence to such mind.

Hence *error* has respect to the false perceptions of the mind in its observation, judgment and understanding, and in the action proceeding therefrom.

Hence *falsehood* has respect to the false affections of the mind contrary to its observation, judgment and understanding, and indicates a lack of *integrity*.

Hence *falsehood* has its basis in a lower affection, which does not proceed from that nature which demands truth for its nourishment.

CRIME—ITS NATURE AND PRACTICE.

A CRIME consists in a willful invasion of the rights of others. The criminality of the invader consists in his disregard of the demands of equity, in his contempt of the authority of right, and exhibits him as under the dominion of the law of selfishness and force. The thief is a wrong-doer in this; he avails himself of the property of another without his consent, and without rendering an equivalent for it. The swindler differs from the technical thief in this; he fraudulently obtains the consent of the owner by means of false inducements or lying representations; that is, the thief obtains the property by stealth, and avoids lying; the swindler obtains it openly by lying. The robber differs from the thief in the exercise of force to obtain what he takes. They all are alike in this; they avail themselves of the property of another without rendering an equivalent for it. The thief obtains his advantage by stealth, the robber by force, and the swindler by fraud, and the moral difference between stealth, force and fraud constitutes the moral difference between thieving, robbing and swindling. So far as they affect the rights of their victim, there is no difference.

The disposition to avail one's-self of the labor or property of another without rendering an equivalent, constitutes the criminal condition of the mind. When the mind comes to that condition, and determines to gratify its desires, it matters but little whether it resort to stealth, force or falsehood to carry out its plans; the injury consists not in the manner of doing the wrong, but in the matter of the wrong itself. If I am to be deprived of my watch without an equivalent for it, it is of but secondary consequence to me whether it is forcibly taken from my pocket, or stealthily abstracted from my desk, or fraudulently solicited from my hand. My loss in either case is the same; and the disposition on

the part of the criminal to appropriate that which is mine to his own use is the same; and to deprive me of it without rendering an equivalent for it. So, then, thieving, swindling and robbing, each express the same moral condition of mind, and derive their names from the manner of giving expression to that condition. So far as depravity of heart, a selfish disregard of right and infidelity to just principles are concerned, they are the same; and the heart that would swindle had it immunity from detection, would steal, or had it courage, would rob. Of the three characters the robber is the most manly, for he has boldness and courage to face the danger, and take his chance in the contest, while the thief and swindler play the coward as well as the villain; and the swindler is the most despicable of the three, as he adds the character of the liar to that of the coward and villain.

It may be urged that the man who obtains the property or labor of another by the consent of the owner, even if it was obtained by false and fraudulent representations, is not as guilty as one who obtains it by stealth or force. But wherein is the immorality of the latter greater than the former? So far as its effects upon the individual plundered of his rights are concerned, the injury is as great. He consented to part with his property or labor upon condition the representations made to him were true, and upon no other conditions. The truth of the representations can not be separated from his parting with his property. So far as the character of the swindler; so far as his intention to avail himself of that which he had no honest and just right to; so far as an intention to injure and defraud his victim; so far as a dishonest and corrupt intention can make him criminal, is concerned, he is as guilty as the thief and robber. Everything except the *manner* of doing the wrong is the same; and as character has reference to the *matter* rather than manner, in character the swindler is a thief and robber.

Now I wish it distinctly understood that the evil or wickedness of crime affecting property consists in its injustice. It would not be wrong for me to take your property and appropriate it to myself, without rendering you an equivalent for it, were it not violating the principles of justice and right for me to do so. It

is the injustice of the thing that makes it criminal, and the criminal characters of the thief, the robber, etc., are seen in their utter disregard of the claims of justice and the authority of right—in their utter destitution of correct principles to guide them in their intercourse and relations with man. Injustice, dishonesty or impurity are ingredients of all real crimes, and just so far as any or all of these ingredients characterize any act of our lives, so far is that act criminal in its influence and consequences.

In our intercourse with our fellow-men, justice requires that the most perfect equality of burdens should be borne by each; that is, that you should be compelled to submit to no more inconvenience or suffering on my account, than I should be willing to render of my own to you; that is, if I would avail myself of the fruit of your toil and fatigue to advantage me, I should render you an equal amount of toil and fatigue, or its equivalent. Justice will not permit me to live at your expense, neither will it permit you to live at my expense. Justice demands equivalents; it will take nothing more, it will be satisfied with nothing less. No one can fulfill his true destiny and be the slave of another—be subject to be plundered of the products of his labor without receiving an equivalent for it. Every man is justly entitled to the fruit of his toil, and whoever plunders him of it, in whole or in part, is guilty of a wrong, violates the fundamental principle of justice, and is obnoxious to the charge of injustice and wrong; and it matters not how he has done it, the injustice of the transaction can not be mitigated by the fashionable, genteel or legal manner in which it was done. Justice has no respect to the manner, but to the matter of the act.

What can be a plainer proposition than that a man is justly entitled to the fruit of his toil? If he is not entitled to it, who is? Who can set up a claim to it superior to his? And upon what principle can any such foreign claim be founded? No man can acquire any title to the just property of another, unless that title be freely transferred to him by its proprietor. No man has a right to seek the transfer of such title without rendering its proprietor a fair equivalent for it. If he seek to obtain it by stealth, he is a thief at heart; if he seek to obtain it by fraud, he is a swindler; if he seek to obtain it by force, he is a robber,

and whoever seeks to obtain from the proprietor his title to his property without rendering him a fair equivalent, must seek it in one of these three ways, and consequently must be in principle a thief, a swindler or a robber.

It will be remembered that in another article I proposed to demonstrate that the thief, swindler and robber were educated to be such by the practices which prevailed in society; that the principles upon which men transacted their business were the same as the principles upon which these classes transacted their business, and that the only difference between them was, the thief, swindler and robber carried out the principles to their ultimate, and hence made them more conspicuous. We have already seen that the criminality of the act of swindling, stealing and robbing consisted in the injustice involved in the transaction, and that the criminality of the mind consisted in its total disregard of the claims of justice and the authority of right; that in each of these respects the crimes were alike, and took their different names from the different manners in which that criminal state of mind gave it expression; that they all sought to accomplish the same thing, the one by fraud, the other by stealth, and the last by force.

Now whoever seeks to avail himself of the just rights and property of another without rendering a fair equivalent for the same, must avail himself, directly or indirectly, of one of these means, and consequently must exhibit, in a more or less matured state, the character of these recognized criminals, and his practice upon such principles of injustice must, from the very law of necessity, tend to develop such a character; and hence such principles prevailing in society, they cannot fail of educating men to be thieves, swindlers and robbers.

I will illustrate this position by examining the leading principle upon which men strive to make their exchanges, either of labor or the products of the same. Their first object is to part with as little as possible; their second, to obtain the greatest possible amount for that with which they do part; or, in other terms, their effort is to obtain as much of the labor and property of others, without rendering any equivalent for it, as possible. The larger the amount obtained, and the less the amount rendered for it, de-

termines the attractiveness of the business; consequently every circumstance which induces a necessity in the holder of an article to part with it upon some consideration, however small, is seized upon by the buyer, to compel him to part with it at the lowest possible price; and if the trader has the monopoly of an article which the people must have, he will demand a price for it which will tax the utmost ability of his customers to purchase. The object is to avail himself of that which in equity and justice belongs to another, without rendering an equivalent for it, and he will adopt all means not criminal in the eye of the law to accomplish his object.

The attorney finds a client in distress. Suspicion has fastened upon him, and the law has laid its hand upon him, and he is put upon his defence. Everything is at stake—life, liberty, character, property—and being in the meshes of the law, he must employ some one acquainted with its intricacies and technicalities. He feels that everything is at stake with him; he manifests this feeling, and the attorney takes advantage of him. He demands more for a few hours' labor than the poor client has been enabled to accumulate for years of sweat and toil. Often is an humble client obliged to pay hundreds and thousands of dollars for the services of a lawyer for a few hours, or days at most, and thus to beggar himself and family. Now, upon what principle of equity and fair dealing is the attorney authorized to demand weeks, months, and years of toil of his humble client, for only a few hours of his own? Does he render a fair equivalent in labor?

Nothing has disgusted me more than the practice prevailing in this profession. Such absolute plundering can not be beaten among professed thieves, swindlers and robbers. An individual, after idling away his time for two years in a lawyer's office, and answering, on examination, some half dozen questions, is admitted to practice as an attorney and counselor-at-law, etc. He opens an office, and advertises for business. He is perhaps no better qualified for his profession than nine-tenths of the community who never saw a law book. Yet he is called "squire," and that is sufficient to authorize him to commence a system of plunder. He must have fifteen, twenty, fifty or a hundred dollars for services

for which his equal in every respect, laboring in the ordinary vocations of life, would not be able to demand and collect a single dollar. Take two young men: place one in the lawyer's office, and the other as an apprentice to learn some mechanical trade. The apprenticed lawyer spends two years in reading a little, writing a little, and idling a good deal. The apprenticed mechanic spends his two years in faithful and constant toil, and at the end of two years the one graduates a lawyer, with Blackstone, Chitty, Starkey, etc., and the other graduates a joiner, with his saw and jack-plane, and jointer, etc. Now, upon what principle of equity and fair dealing is it that the non-producing lawyer is entitled to a thousand or two thousand dollars a year, while the producing mechanic must be contented with two or three hundred?

It is a principle prevailing in the profession to charge for services which are, in respect to labor, the same, different prices, according to the ability of the client, the importance of the case to him, according to his necessities, real or imaginary; in short, according to those circumstances which give the attorney power over him to extort an exorbitant fee. No remark is more common than that the client is in a tight place, and he is able to respond to a heavy fee, and therefore it is proper to put it to him, to use a cant phrase. No one at all acquainted with the profession will dispute that such kind of extortion is universally practiced. Now strip this practice of all the respectability which it has gained from the standing of those who practice it, and examine it in principle, and it amounts to just this: the attorney takes advantage of his client's ignorance and necessity, real or imaginary, to extort from him his money, property or labor, without rendering an equivalent for it; that is, he does not render to his client one-tenth, twentieth, and frequently not one-hundredth as much labor or service as he extorts from him. This practice contains in it all the ingredients of the crimes of swindling, thieving, robbing and counterfeiting. First the motive in the criminal is to avail himself of that which is honestly and justly another's, without rendering an equivalent for it, and therefore dishonestly to become the possessor of that which is another's. The same motive governs the attorney. His design is to avail himself of the labor, money or property of his client, without

rendering an equivalent; second, the effect is the same. The criminal deprives the owner of his property without leaving him anything available in its place. So is it with the attorney. For all he receives above a just fee for his services, he leaves no equivalent, and the poor client is as much injured by such extortion, as though he had been swindled, plundered or robbed of it. The difference is simply this: the thief takes advantage of the owner's absence, the swindler takes advantage of his ignorance, the robber takes advantage of his weakness, the counterfeiter takes advantage of his ignorance, and the lawyer takes advantage of his necessity. They all alike take advantage, and avail themselves of that which is not honestly theirs; and inasmuch as it is more honorable in public estimation to take advantage in one way than the other, men wishing to preserve their reputable standing in society have a choice as to the profession they will adopt for accomplishing the same result.

The next class of society to which your attention is called, is that of the speculator. This is a very general term, and in principle might include almost all classes of public traders. The principle upon which general mercantile business is done is the same. The object is to *make*, not earn money; that is, to accumulate for themselves the money earned by others, without rendering a fair equivalent for it. To obtain the most, and render the least, that is possible, in return, is the grand desideratum of the trading or speculating class. Their object being to avail themselves of the labor, money or property of others without rendering an equivalent, it is expected that, being dishonest in desire and design, they will be dishonest in practice to the extent that the law and the standard of respectability in society will permit them to be, without hazarding character and personal liberty; and when we remember that the laws are framed, adjudicated upon, and enforced, mainly by the profession whose character we have just examined, and that the standard of respectability is graduated by the practice and moral sense of these men whose characters we are now examining, it is to be expected that the speculator will have great latitude, and yet keep within the requirements of law and public sentiment.

Such being the desire and design of this class of men, and

such being only the restraining influences operating upon them, they will adopt various methods for accomplishing their objects. They will take every advantage the law will permit, and devise various methods for evading the letter of the law. The speculator seeks to take advantage of man's necessities, as a general thing, although he does not confine his operations to that single sphere. He will as readily take advantage of his ignorance, if he has an opportunity; but that he may take advantage in some way, he not unfrequently endeavors to create necessities. Thus, if the speculator can monopolize some of the necessities of life, and hold them out of market until the demand has become so great that he can use his monopoly as a means of extortion, he is doing a legitimate and capital business. Take the article of flour. If the speculator can control all the flour and wheat in market, he can affix what price he sees fit, and extort it from his customers. Instances of this kind we have all witnessed. I remember some time in 1884 or 1885, one week flour was worth in market, at retail, three dollars and seventy-five cents by the barrel; the next week it stood at seven dollars. This difference was occasioned by certain speculators in that article, who first borrowed large amounts at the banks in this city, and went into the southern counties and contracted for the surplus wheat and flour at its minimum price, and then demanded an advance of three dollars and twenty-five cents on the barrel, and the consumers were obliged to pay that amount into the pockets of these speculators, and these individuals, in less than one week's time cleared over fifty thousand dollars in that operation.

Now upon what principle of equity or justice did this fifty thousand dollars become transferred into the pockets of these men? Did they render any equivalent for it? They first by means of money cut off the supply of flour, and purposely induced a necessity in their customers to pay an exorbitant price for it. Here, taking advantage of that necessity, they extorted from the pockets of the people that enormous profit, and for the fifty thousand thus extorted, they rendered no equivalent, and it was that they might thus extort an enormous sum without rendering an equivalent, that they proceeded in the transaction; and those who paid the greatest portion of this enormous profit,

were those least able to do it—who were dependent upon their daily earnings for what they lived upon from day to day, and who could not lay up a store of provisions beforehand; it came from those who were obliged to buy their bread-stuff by the shilling and the quarter. And when these men retired from the field with their thousands in their pockets, they were sporting upon those dimes they had wrung from the hands of the toiling poor, through a necessity they had imposed upon them. Now upon what principle of justice or honest dealing did these men differ in that transaction from the thief, the swindler, etc.? They availed themselves of the hard earnings of others, without rendering an equivalent therefor. They designed to do so, and to be as unjust as such conduct could make them. They deliberately planned the robbing, and as deliberately executed it. To be sure, they did it in such a way as to escape the censure of the law and the reprobation of public sentiment, but nevertheless, they as purposely and as effectually plundered the community as though they had passed a counterfeit three dollar bill for every barrel of flour which was sold.

The rule which governs among speculators or trading gamblers, is to avail themselves of as much of the property of others as possible, without rendering an equivalent, and the whole art of trading or speculating consists in the fertility of the imagination to devise schemes, and in the tact and talent of the individual to execute them, by means of which individuals may be plundered of that which is justly their own; and one is denominated shrewd or smart, and becomes popular according as he is successful in his plans. Let any one present who has hitherto lived in obscurity, devise some means by which he can levy tribute upon the toil of millions, and take a portion of the widow and orphan's mite, and put it into his own pocket, until he shall accumulate a few hundred thousand dollars, and he would soon come out of his obscurity; he would soon be an object to be looked up to, and would be courted and flattered, even by those whom he had robbed.

Again, the principle of taking advantage of a man's necessities extends to all classes in society. Some classes are better able to take this advantage than others, owing to their position,

but nevertheless all seek to take what advantage they can. The farmer, sometimes called the honest farmer, is not excepted. He is generally in a great measure prevented from taking large advantages, owing to the competition which prevails in his business; but it is a lack of opportunity, and not disposition, that keeps him from doing so. Let no one's orchard bear but his, and he can not afford to sell apples for less than one dollar per bushel, although he would have thought he was doing well in getting twenty-five cents when his neighbors had a plenty. Let the rust strike his neighbor's wheat, and although he has an abundant harvest, never better, yet he can not afford to take less than two dollars per bushel for his wheat, although one dollar would have paid him well had his neighbors had a plenty. Let the potato-rot prevail among his neighbor's potato-patches, and although he escape entirely, he can not afford his potatoes for less than seventy-five cents per bushel; and so on through every variety of produce he raises. He is as ready to take the advantage of his neighbor whenever he has an opportunity as any other class. What cares he, more than the speculator, whether his exorbitant demand takes food from the mouths of the poor and perishing? That, he thinks, does not concern him. His business is as far as possible to keep what he has, and get what he can. He rejoices in those conditions which make wheat two, three and four dollars per bushel, while his granaries are groaning under their burdens. He calls such times evidence of prosperity, and in his thanksgivings he blesses God that he has thus prospered him in his business, not hearing the cry of the needy and perishing at his door, which is raised in consequence of the very prosperity he feels so grateful for.

So it is with the broker, the banker and the capitalist of whatever pursuit. The principle is to take the advantage to the extent that legal forms will permit. The motto is, the world is a cheat, and the devil take the hindmost, and each rushes forward, appropriating whatever he can, no matter whether justly or unjustly. Thus men are educated and disciplined from childhood to be dishonest and unjust in their commercial intercourse with their fellow-men. The difference between common business transactions and that of swindling, thieving, robbing,

counterfeiting and the like, is more in form than in substance. The difference in intention is not material. Both intend to take some advantage, by means of which they may be enabled to appropriate to themselves that which honestly and justly belongs to another, without rendering an equivalent for it. If the thief takes advantage of absence, the lawyer takes advantage of ignorance and apparent or real necessity; if the robber takes advantage of weakness or fear, the speculator takes advantage of poverty and necessity, and so on. In either case, the intention is to be unjust and unequal in their property relations, and the consequence is, they are so. Now, in a moral point of view, in the eye of justice and good faith as a divine quality, wherein can the one boast over the other? One has plundered in defiance of the prohibitions of the statute; the other has sought the protection of the forms of law, and plundered by its license. One stands reprobated by community, the other praised and petted.

Such being the true character of the principles which prevail among men in their business transactions, is it astonishing that crime abounds in spite of all your criminal courts, jails, penitentiaries and gibbets? You may increase their number a hundred fold, and there would be none the less crime under this unjust and dishonest system of commercial intercourse. So long as the principal difference between what are called honorable business transactions, and crime, consists only in the form of doing the wrong, men will not be hedged away from the commission of crimes by any such artificial paling. Men must be taught to respect right and love that which is just and true.

In this age of mammon-worship, when wealth seems almost indispensable to respect; when a man's standing in society depends much upon the pecuniary power he can wield, there is every temptation to induce men to avail themselves of every means to accumulate fortunes. This they can not do to any considerable extent without availing themselves of the labor and just rights of others. Just so far as they possess themselves of more than by their just labor they have produced, others have less. Wherever you find men of great wealth, it is certain that the honest laborer has been plundered of his just dues. You may be obliged to trace it through several changes or hands, but

it will come to that at last. Princely wealth must be attended by squalid poverty. When robbers flourish, the poor victim must suffer.

That kind of business which tends to center wealth in the hands of a few individuals, is best calculated to rob the mass; and as the principles upon which business is transacted in society have that tendency, they are evidently wrong and unjust, and being so, they can not fail of being pernicious in their influence. What is the propriety of punishing a poor man for stealing a few pounds of pork, when the same power and influence which punishes that form of injustice, encourages and sustains another form which would take the "whole hog?" It is evident that the nature of crime is not understood, or society could not so heartily condemn it in one form, and sustain it in another.

Men do not understand that the evil of crimes affecting property consists in the injustice they work to those whose rights are affected. They do not understand that were it not unjust and inequitable to take the property or labor of another without rendering an equivalent, as in the case of swindling, and thieving and counterfeiting, it would really be no crime to commit those depredations. They do not understand that the criminal state of the offender's mind consists in his disregard of the claims of justice and right, and that his criminal interest consists in his intention of unjustly availing himself of the rights and property of another without rendering him that which is just and equal; that he makes use of his counterfeit note or false representation, or pistol, as a means of availing himself of that which does not belong to him; that the counterfeit note, aside from the end he seeks to accomplish by it, is nothing. It is the end sought to be accomplished, and the intention to compass that end, that makes the man really criminal, not the counterfeit note which he only uses as a means. That is only evidence of the end intended.

Such being the real nature of crimes affecting property, why should one man be condemned for entertaining such an unjust and wicked intention, and another be encouraged and sustained in it? Is it not as unjust for me to take advantage of your necessities as of your ignorance? And when I extort from you, under such circumstances, that which is justly yours, do I not

exhibit the same disregard of the claims of justice and right, as though I had obtained it by a counterfeit note? If I can by any means deprive you and your family of bread, unless you will pay me twice the just price of flour, and thus make use of your necessities to extort from you your money and labor, why might I not, upon the same principle, have compelled you to have taken from me a counterfeit note equal to the exorbitant and unjust demand I put upon you? If I had done so, should I have exhibited any clearer intention of availing myself of your labor and money without an equivalent, than I did by taking advantage of your necessities to extort it? and would you have suffered any more injustice in the one case than in the other?

By this course of argument I am not apologizing for the commission of crime, I am not saying that the thief, robber, swindler or counterfeiter are any the less guilty than community hold them to be, or that they should be excused from punishment; but what I wish to have understood is, that they are not alone in their guilt; that those who punish them for committing that form of injustice and wrong, are equally guilty with them; and before a tribunal which looks at offences in their true nature, the judge and jury would frequently be compelled to take the place of the criminal. What I speak of is, that crimes are not unfrequently punished by greater criminals.

Let us recur again to those principles which must be sustained in the individual, if we would remedy the evils which prevail in society; for all evils, physical, social and moral, are the result of violations of the laws of our physical, social, and moral being, and those laws can not be violated without working out unpropitious results. Man, as an individual and immortal being, individualizing for himself, is necessarily possessed of individuality and sovereignty; and as all men in these respects are equal, no one can exceed the limits of his sovereignty without trespassing upon the sovereignty of others, and when one does this, he interrupts the harmony of the social system, and violates the principles of justice. This he has no right to do; for if he has a right to trespass upon the rights of others, others have a right to trespass upon his, and this at once brings society into a state of conflict and antagonism, and right is at once resolved into

power, and might becomes the standard of right. Now the sovereignty of the individual recognizes, or rather involves the right in him to have absolute dominion over his own person, and exclusive claim to the fruit of his just labors; and as every individual has this sovereignty and its incidents, each is bound to respect it and them in others, in their relations to, and transactions with, each other; and out of this relation and the obligations arising therefrom come into view the principles of justice. For if all men are equal in their individuality and sovereignty, they are all equal in everything incident thereto, and hence have an inalienable right to demand that their individuality and sovereignty shall at all times be respected, and by so being, that justice shall be done to them.

Now there can be no plainer principle than that every individual should recognize the same natural rights in others which he claims for himself, and that he should pursue no course of conduct toward others which he would not be willing, nay, which he would not demand, that others should pursue toward him; because as an individual he sustains the same relation to others which they sustain to him, and herein is justice, which is omnipotent in its claims. It will be obeyed or it will punish. As ye judge ye shall be judged, is its declaration. The individual that invades the sovereignty of another by his conduct, authorizes others to invade his. By the judgment he pronounces upon the rights of others, he judges himself.

It is no trifling offence to invade the sovereignty of an individual, no matter how done. That disregard of the claims of justice which characterizes the individual who wantonly deprives a fellow-being of that which is justly his, places him in open rebellion against the rights of universal man. The blow purposely given which deprives a fellow-being of his life, is, in principle, aimed at universal existence, and would strike from being all that is—would even annihilate the offender himself. It is committing high treason against nature and God. The fetter that unjustly binds a human being in slavery, puts forth its links to shackle the whole family of man. When the demands of right and justice are wantonly disregarded and trampled upon by man, he has committed the highest offence of which he is capable.

The demands of justice are positive, and have reference to that which is real. Justice and right are not fictitious or imaginary existences; they have reference to the *matter* of the wrong, not to the *manner* of committing it. Justice demands that every human being should bear his proportion of the burdens of human or social existence; it demands that I should make no greater demand upon your labor than I should render you of my own; that each should render unto others that which is honest and just; and demanding this, it will be satisfied with nothing less. It can not be put off by any plea of custom or fashion. The tricks of trade are but another name for the tricks of crime; the demands of justice are as much violated by the speculator as by the thief or counterfeiter. The attorney who will take advantage of a criminal at the bar to extort from him more than a just reward for his services, as much violates the demands of justice as the criminal he is defending; and if the criminal was justly at the bar, the attorney ought in justice to take his place, and be put on trial the moment his client leaves it.

I have thus briefly endeavored to demonstrate the false and criminal character of the principles which men recognize in their common business transactions. That they are false and criminal can not be denied; that they are based upon that upon which all crime is predicated, is true as heaven. That their influence upon those who practice them is criminal is a necessary consequence, and can never be otherwise while justice is justice and man is man. Crimes will prevail in society in spite of all efforts at reform, in spite of all criminal codes, all sanguinary and cruel punishments, until the business principles of men are changed. As sure as exercises from the law of nature must strengthen and develop, so sure must such business practices strengthen and develop crime. This strife for accumulating fortunes beyond the productive industry of the individual, must resort to appropriating the labor and hard earnings of others without rendering equivalents. The object is unjust, and consequently the means must be so.

If we would reform the world, what then must be our first effort? If we would do away with crime, to what end must we first direct our efforts? There can be but one answer. We

must reform the principles upon which the business transactions of life are founded, and by which they are conducted. Justice must be studied, and its claims must be observed. Wealth must not be a passport to honor and respectability, but must be considered rather presumptive evidence of dishonor, injustice and fraud, as in truth it is. Every means by which one man would avail himself of the rights of another without rendering an equivalent, must be considered false and criminal, and must be received as evidence of a false and criminal character in him who makes use of them.

PROPOSITION.

MORAL perception must precede moral love; and while the moral perceptions precedes the moral affections, the condition and action known as hypocrisy take place.

Hence the hypocrite outwardly has respect for the good of others, and conforms to the externals of truth, purity and love, that he may serve himself; that is, he perceives what is good and proper to be done for others, but being in self-love, he is induced to do it only so far as it will redound to his advantage.

Hence moral perceptions may exist in an individual while he is yet under the dominion of his selfish affections; and as moral affection develops, there must necessarily arise antagonism, and this antagonism will continue until self is destroyed.

HUMAN STANDARD OF PERFECTION.

BY LOVE M. WHITCOMB.

SCIENCE resolves the world of matter into a few elements; these may be re-resolved and found to be one and the same element in different forms of manifestation. The elements of spirit also all resolve themselves into one principle of life. The attributes of Spirit, as its love, power and wisdom, are the spheres of its attainments and not its elements. The principle of life pervading all matter, as also all Spirit, is the divine breath, the life of God, the moving cause of all effect. Starting, then, from this point, that all life is one and the same life, since all is of and from God, we desire to consider whence the variety of manifestation, so infinite as never to repeat itself. Included within the sphere of external manifestation we find all form, both individualized and concomitant. Measuring, according to our capacity, the infinite expression of harmonic law, *relations* become *creations*. The *mode of manifestation* is an expression of an infinite cause through finite relations. Subject to all the changes of those relations, matter becomes the varied expression of divine harmony. It being below the plane of man's development, its harmony is readily recognized and acceded to by him. As science reveals this expression of harmony in the material world, all previous interpretations yield to its decision, and perfection becomes the established fact of the universe without. Man beholds the sun shining to ripen his fruit and grain, the rain falling to nourish his fields, the dew descending to revive his withered grass. Causes become natural and effects beneficial, and he makes his highest endeavors yield to these. But the Spirit or individualized life is above this plane of manifestation, and he alone comprehends its development who has attained a height above the *general expression*, so as to look below him for fact and proof, and

grasp the relations through his higher advancement. Thus man is ever perceiving incongruity and inharmony in the world of spirit or individualized intelligence. The freedom and equality of the natural world, when contrasted with the seeming slavery and distinction of the spiritual, or world of individuals, is a constant and fruitful source of unhappiness and misunderstanding. Ascribing unto that which is considered the cause of this inharmony, partiality and favoritism, men have made God a tyrant, and their conception of attainment unto him does not contradict the tyranny and partiality which is the constant expression of their motives and desires. Measuring the hight of all things by themselves, the creation becomes either an expression of love or hate, as they conceive of its relations through their heart or intellect. Now, the result of these false interpretations of the higher world of manifestation, produces the constant endeavor to harmonize the higher life with the lower, which is better comprehended, and is therefore believed to have more of unity. To regulate the matter, and save himself from this conceived mistake, man creates *standards*. Perfection becomes unto him a standard, yet that perfection is precisely what he makes it by his own attainment. Thus he is ever striving to re-create all things into his own image. The standard of the Jews was a king adorned with worldly splendor, since their measure or standard was found in their interpretation of the possible harmony of their exterior world and their spiritual attainment. The magnificence of the world of Judea made glorious their interpretation of the external life, and no higher form of development was revealed to the spiritual than that. The pomp of external ceremonies grew out of their interpretation of external objects; therefore a higher spiritual development received from them no recognition. A temporal king was what they desired, a restoration of their power their highest aspiration, a god of battles their deity. Their standard was the result of their sphere of action. The Anglo-Saxon God is a God of rewards and punishments, since the active effort that has conquered all physical conditions, and made the triumph over matter to result in the gratification of power, makes it esteem that the highest which yields the greatest reward. Their aim is thus the attainment of worldly

distinction through the avenues of wealth and honor. Thus have all races and nations made for themselves a God from their interpretation of the exterior world, modified by their spiritual attainment. Now, to make a God to correspond with one's own soul seems the height of profanation; yet what men call God is their standard of perfection. Their highest sense of right makes God's righteousness; their purity of purpose makes his holiness; their affection makes his love; their divine instinct his wisdom; for it is impossible to comprehend, imagine or believe in, what one has not the elements of in his nature, and the infinity of those attributes that one ascribes to Deity, being incomprehensible by man, each measures that infinity by his recognition of the extent of his own possible attainment.

Therefore there can be no fixed external standard of right or of wrong, since each is ever interpreted by the internal, and that interpretation is modified and changed in each individual. Neither can one's standard of now be the standard of the future, since every new relation brings some new interpretation. To make a standard of perfection to be recognized by all men, is as impossible as to represent any object from different points of compass in precisely the same form. The excellence of the standard will lie in the excellence of the individual who measures, not in the established standard. Jesus was great to many because of his works, which exceeded their attainment; to others because of his supposed power to bestow future blessings to correspond with his earthly power. His true greatness was recognized by few, and then not in its highest reality, because their standard could not measure what was unrecognizable in themselves. The disunion of mankind, its wrangles and dissensions, arise from no desired hostility, but from the positive character of man's interpretation of others, by himself. Looking upon the inharmonic expression of the relations of mankind, one considers immediately that the universe is at fault somewhere, and that the founder of it, in not setting it right, must prove either his inefficiency or injustice. But out of disorder comes the perfection of order. The dreams and cheats of fancy only disturb the mind not rightly balanced, and that no longer perceives the true relation of things. The inharmony of the digestive organs

will make a cloudless day dark with sorrow, and the derangement of the optic nerve turn the world up side down; but the derangement caused by the ill-balanced intellect and affections, makes not only heaven's light darkness, but the possibility of that brightness discredited. To comprehend the measurable things of the external world is comparatively easy, because the interior includes the exterior, and the higher can know of the lower; but as distance is measured by the eye, and not by the medium of light, so is perfection measured, not by its true infinite revealment, but by the mind's own extent or capacity of reach. To establish claim of judgment is impossible. That alone can be judged which is revealed in one's-self, and that requires no judgment, since it knows itself. *To perceive motives is to distinguish relations*; and the existence of those being the true revelation of harmony, condemnation ceases. One of the most fruitful causes of mental disturbance is what is termed self-condemnation, which is often an attempt to harmonize what can not be harmonized, and to bring into one sphere of action what properly belongs to another; to endeavor to place a standard without one's-self, and make all departure from it the occasion of self-chastisement. This is the exercise of the reason and the intellect, and not of the affections or instincts. The affections alone are capable of judgment, since motives arise from the desires; but the higher office of the intuition permits no judgment, and only finds its standard in its divine monitions. Measure and weight are not found here. Jesus recognized this, for he admonished his followers to judge no man. The revelation of the higher possibility of every soul, and the recognition of relations, made his charity involuntary but all-controlling.

Aristotle said to his followers, consider well what has distinguished the condition of every son of Teus, and you will then make him a god whom now you pray the gods to curse.

Whatever relations you sustain to your fellow-men, you sustain not by virtue of merit or demerit, but from necessity. Your self-justification must become their justification also, since in giving yourself a position, you must do it by means of a law, and not from merit, and that will be found to be the governing law of their condition also. And here we are not to condemn a just re-

cognition of one's own position ; it can never produce unworthy exaltation, because it is the soul's prerogative. Self-justification will never come from intuition, more than self-condemnation ; but a true recognition of one's own attainment is not self-justification, but the divine light revealed *unto* the intellect and understanding, not *through* them. This recognition is necessary to the entire comprehension of the relations of others, and is charity made expressive in the light of wisdom. The sun-light falls on the valley. The law of light is revealment, and from every separate spire of grass, and from every tiniest flower, goes forth the expression of itself. Myriads of flowers are in every sun-gleam. That one is for me which lies in my range of vision. I see it as the light reveals it unto me. A little shadow suffices to shut out its image, but it destroys not the flower, the recognition only is wanting. That which intercepts its image from my sight may lie as near as my own eye, or anywhere along the range of vision. The relation of the flower unto me is the same, whether I perceive it or not ; the flower, the medium of light, the point of observation, are none of them wanting. Now the intuition is as the light, the understanding the eye ; that which is revealed only requires its interpretation to the understanding to become a part of consciousness. True charity or justification is the revealment, through the intuition unto the intellect, of the relations of things, the measuring of effects by causes. The man who desires to benefit his fellow-men, can do it effectually only when he perceives their standard of development, and measures it not by his own, but by *their relations*. All true reform must thus commence. The external effort of charities, of punishments, of public opinion, custom, civil law, will never reach the root of the evil that good men mourn. Courts of justice have their standards, and they measure and weigh and attempt to adjust, but they never reformed an individual, save in altering his conditions of life and sphere of action, and that had much more easily been done through the effort of true benevolence and fraternal love. Custom places its standard and prescribes its limit, and its effect is to bring all into subjection to the external. Public opinion is the mean external standard, which brings up or lowers, according to the various elements of character it has

to subjugate. Positive good and evil are believed in, and therefore punishments are deemed necessary. Public charities are the result of the affections acting upon the intellect. But all these means are external; we must labor not from without but from within; the standard must be the soul's highest aspiration reaching unto *all relations*, and thus including as much of infinite love as the soul is capable of. Each expression of this love being a natural and spontaneous act, is in its results ever divine. As the sun shines the same through transparent ether or heavy mists, whether the earth be in a position to receive its rays directly or vertically, giving beauty and life to all things, and blessing through all change, its power not depending on its beneficence, which is equal, but on the condition of objects in regard to it—so does the love of God expressed through individuals wait no conditions, but with its bright effulgence becomes the disseminator and dispenser of *eternal life*.

The standard of truth, righteousness, purity and holiness, by which mankind measures its attainment, is the result of two causes—his own interior light, and the effect of external influence upon him. To weigh by one's own conscience, so called, is one effort; by other men's, another. The attempt to make the two harmonize has produced religious association. The Church, through the product of combined individual influence, yet becomes a power separate from individuals. The conservative church forbids free thought; the individual demands it. The result is a yielding to the priesthood the external interpretation of duty, and making the daily walk and conversation play with its hands according to the weakness or strength of individual self-reliance. Thus we find the great foe to human progress to be, not individual conservatism, but the authority conceded to associated influence, which creates an external standard of right and duty; and the constant effort to harmonize the interior with that, makes man profess one thing and practice another; profess to love his brother, while every act may be a wrong to that brother; profess a desire to practice the law of righteousness, while injustice is the only fruit of the profession. There are two methods of reform, then—one to shake man's reliance on external authority, the other to make the external standard high, that it

may not cramp and confine the individual conscience. He who labors for the regeneration of the world must close his eyes to no influence that retards man's development. Yielding to the condition of things, and through faith trusting the harmony of that condition, individuals become expressions of the whole, and the whole reveals the individual influence. By the divine light of wisdom should we labor, then, not to create an external standard through arbitrary rules, but awakening within each soul the consciousness of its own divine element, each should become *a law unto himself.*

LOVE M. WHITCOME.

PROPOSITION.

IN passing from self-love to moral and social, moral love perfects only as the self-love subsides, and the action proceeding from this condition of love first respects the truth and the good of neighbor in their uses to self.

Hence, during this transition period, any resistance to the will and action will arouse self, and beget feelings similar to those arising from the resistance of self.

Hence, in the progress of development the individual will be engaged in moral and charitable acts from selfish impulses; that is, while the act has respect to the good of others, the uses of that good have respect to self-gain and gratification.

ALL progressive beings are necessarily subject to influences external to themselves; and under the fundamental law of their being, all influences not harmonizing with that fundamental law must awaken resistance.

Hence the very law which leads to the highest destiny of the soul must resist every opposing influence, and the pain and suffering incident thereto arise from such resistance.

Hence, by the very principle that harmony begets pleasure and happiness, must discord and resistance beget suffering.

Hence all pain is indicative of a departure from the true relation and condition, and is admonitory.

A WORD TO THE LABORING CLASS.

OUR whole social system is radically defective, and should be abandoned. It is based upon force and fraud, and its fruits are injustice and oppression. One portion of community are doomed to perpetual servitude and poverty, while their oppressors reap the fruits of their labor and live in idleness, and wallow in wealth and luxury. All real wealth is the product of labor, and should belong to those whose labor has produced it. But such is not the case. The mass of wealth is in the hands of those who have never toiled for it, while the mass of the laborers are compelled to struggle for the mere necessities of life.

This transfer of wealth, or rather of the products of labor, from the hands of the toiling poor to the coffers of the rich, is what keeps the laborer in this destitute condition, and makes him the serf or slave of capital; and this transfer is the result of the operation of certain principles incorporated into our social system, and can never be prevented while our social system remains unchanged. These principles, judged of in the light of their fruits, are unjust, and can never produce other than unjust results. Nothing can be plainer than that any system which robs the laborer of the fruit of his constant toil, and puts it into the pockets of the idle and non-producing consumer, is unjust and wrong; and yet that such a system prevails can not be denied by the oppressor or the oppressed. That such a system has prevailed from the earliest history of society is equally true. What force could not do to plunder labor, fraud has done.

Nothing can be more apparent to any one who opens his eyes and looks out upon society, than that wealth is not found in the hands of those whose toil and sweat has produced it, nor have the producers received any equivalent on parting with it. By

some magic process, by some *hocus pocus* art, the laborer is converted into a machine for producing wealth, and it only stays with him while in the process of being manufactured. When fairly produced, it is *presto* changed into the pockets of the wealthy capitalist.

The humble needle-woman stitches her life into richly-embroidered silks, satins and fine linens, but they are for the wealthy and idle to wear; the humble wood-sawyer bends his back over his saw-buck, and prepares fuel for the fire, but it is to warm the idle and work-despising aristocrat; the toiling mechanic works night and day to finish, in the most tasteful and exquisite manner, various articles of furniture, but they are to make comfortable and adorn the mansions of the rich; the carpenter, the joiner, the mason and the painter, expend their strength to erect costly, superb and princely mansions, but they are for lily-fingered capital and non-producing idleness to live in.

Let us for a few moments make a pilgrimage into the world, and see what we can discover, and ask an explanation of what we see. First let us enter this stately mansion on our right, but before entering it, let us examine it in its majestic and beautiful proportions. Did he who inhabits it quarry and hew those stones? Did he expend his strength and sacrifice his ease to bring them to their place in the building? What part of the labor required to build that edifice did he perform? None of it. It was all performed by other hands. The men who expend their strength and skill in its construction live in humble dwellings; their magnificent designs and skillful executions were for others, not themselves. Did he by his labor prepare and cultivate those grounds which surround his mansion? No. The humble artist, by whose labor and skill these grounds have been made to assume the appearance of a second Eden, lives in a hovel in some crowded alley, and sleeps on straw.

But let us enter this palace and see what is within it. We can spend but little time in its examination, and therefore can examine but a few things. Look at the magnificent furniture—chairs, sofas, tables, carpets, etc.—were they manufactured by the labor of the lordly owner? No; not even did he put forth his finger to place them in their present position. Those who spent their

strength in producing them live in humble houses, furnished, if at all, with the plainest and least costly furniture; their expenditure of strength and taste was not for themselves; they must be content with that which costs little, because these lords demand that which costs much. Examine the fashionable and costly apparel with which his family are clothed; did they manufacture that clothing by their own labor? No. It even took the time and strength of the poor errand-boy to bring it to their mansion, and they keep a maid to help them put it on. The poor laborer who manufactured those articles of apparel lived in a garret, fed on one scanty meal a day, and shivered over a few dying embers while she was putting the work together. Their table groans under the load of delicacies furnished to tickle their palates. The air is burdened with the smell of their savory dishes; but what labor did they bestow in producing those delicacies, or even preparing them for the table? None—absolutely none. The laborer who produced those articles of food is despised for his vulgarity and poverty, and the cook who prepared them for the table occupies the humblest and most obscure corner of that mansion, and can only feed on what remains after the lordly proprietor and family have feasted to their fill.

Thus I might proceed indefinitely to point out the difference between the humble laborer and the lordly idler. One portion of community are doomed to perpetual toil, poverty and privation, that another portion may live in idleness and luxury, and grow rich and insolent on the unpaid toil of those they despise. Now, can it be doubted for one moment that by some means great injustice is done? and that whatever those means may be they are wrong and criminal, and loudly demand reform? Can it be possible that institutions based upon principles which work out such results, are in harmony with the divine government, and ought to be permitted to stand? Are we to conclude that one portion of community are born to be the slaves of another portion, and that they are bound tamely and passively to submit to such cruel and debasing bondage? I answer, No. The man that will tamely submit to be a slave insults humanity, and does as great a wrong to his race as the despot that enslaved him.

Why should one man be made to toil and suffer, that another

might live in ease and idleness? and why should the man so toiling and suffering be looked down upon and despised, while the man who plunders him of his hard earnings is looked up to and respected? What is there in labor which is degrading? What is there in idleness and oppression that is honorable?

*"Fools, indeed, drop the man in their account,
And vote the mantle into majesty."*

But why should men, sensible, respectable men and women do it? Why should the laborer feel himself demeaned by his calling? Why should he acknowledge the supremacy of idleness, and take off his hat and speak in terms of humble deference, and tread softly in the presence of lily-fingered capital?

What is the quality of true honor and respectability? By what principle should they be estimated and determined? That man only should be considered honorable, or worthy of honor, who is most useful, upright and just in his relations and actions. He whose life is no benefit to his race, who lives like a drone upon their bounty, whether plundered by stealth like a thief, by force like a robber, or by fraud like a swindler, a counterfeiter, a speculator or capitalist, is entitled to no respect, no honor. You may do reverence to his mantle, his mansion, his table, etc., and be fools, but you can not respect the man and be honest, sensible men.

Idleness, coupled with wealth and luxury, can have no just claim to respectability or honor; if it has it, it bespeaks folly and not manhood. The man who lives in idleness, that is, who is not engaged in some productive employment—not productive to himself alone, but productive to the world—lives upon the unpaid toil of others, and is an incarnate lump of fraud and injustice; and whatever may be his circumstances or condition, is a public pauper, and feeds upon the fruits of force, fraud or charity. And is there anything in such a character to challenge respect? Is there anything indicative of superior worth in the true sense of the term? If there is, what is it? If idleness is honorable, then bow before the sluggard and do him reverence. Is the possession of property acquired by stealth, or force, or fraud, honorable? Then down with the walls of your peniten-

tiaries, and bring forth the convicts with shouts of approbation and honorable display.

Labor is not only oppressed by capital, but it is degraded. The marks of toil upon the body are indications of bondage in this age of deified wealth. In the circles of wealth and fashion, to be known as a mechanic or laborer, is sure to provoke the look of contempt, and the lip, from habit, curls with scorn. In the age of force and chivalry, which is now passing away, the laborer was a slave, made such by force. Captives taken in battle were at the mercy of their conquerors, and it was one of the gracious acts of the conqueror to spare the lives of his captives and enslave them; and thus labor was mostly performed by slaves, and being so, the occupation became associated with the condition of the laborer; and he being a slave, his labor was servitude; hence slavery and servitude, and the laborer and labor, became synonymous terms, in estimation and in fact.

And in this age of commercial speculation, which has taken the place of chivalry, fraud has taken the place of force; and although the laborer is not *nominally* enslaved by force, he is *actually* enslaved by fraud, and injustice is as really done to him; he is as really plundered, as though he toiled under the lash of a taskmaster. The social arrangements are such that he receives but a small portion of his earnings, and the laborer now sustains the same relation to capital which in former times he sustained to the conqueror by force. If the captive was a slave to power, under the social arrangements of the age in which he lived, so now is the laborer a slave to capital, under the social arrangements of the present age; and as the lordly conqueror despised the bleeding and crushed victim upon whose neck he stood, so now does the lordly capitalist despise the plundered and crushed laborer, out of whose hard earnings he is accumulating his thousands.

And the laborer will be thus despised while he sustains this relation to capital. Servitude and degradation are inseparable, in fact and in estimation. The man who is constantly bowed down to the earth, with no time to look around and above him, no time to develop and expand the immortal principles within; who, when he relaxes his exertion, is maddened by the lash of his

taskmaster, whether he preside in the person of an overseer with his knotted scourge, or in the presence of law and hungry want, can not develop those noble faculties of the mind, which are to raise him high above the plane of the toiling animal, to the rank of the immortal and divine; therefore, until the laborer is emancipated—until he can command his own labor without being under the lash, he will be degraded and despised.

Labor of itself is not degrading. It has been made so by the false customs of society—the degrading and debasing oppression which has been practiced upon the laborer. Labor is honorable. It is necessary to development. It is a part of the economy of the divine government that man shall labor, as much as that he shall think. Labor is as necessary for the health and development of the body, as thinking, investigation or mental labor is for the health and development of the mind; hence man's necessities can only be supplied by labor. That curse said to be pronounced requiring men to eat their bread in the sweat of their faces, was not a curse. It was a blessing, and one that men can not dispense with. Free men from labor, let the earth bring forth spontaneously all that man's necessities require, and man becomes the victim of idleness, enervation, licentiousness and crime. His bosom becomes the hot-bed of all the vices. Therefore I say again that labor is a blessing, and not a curse.

Labor only becomes a curse when the poor laborer is crushed by it—when the oppressor taxes him beyond endurance, or by constant toil cheats his soul of a portion of its birthright. This would not be the case if the laborer were emancipated from capital; if the laborer received the just wages of his labor, and if one class were not permitted to riot in idleness and luxury upon his unpaid toil. Let it be remembered that all the available wealth of the world is the product of labor, and would not have existed had not the hard labor been performed that produced it. When, in a city like this, you see a large proportion of the population living in idleness and luxury, remember that labor produces all the food they eat, all the choice liquors they drink, all the clothing they wear, all the fine equipages they sport, and the princely mansions in which they live.

When you look at the costly churches and public buildings,

remember that they are the production of, and a tax upon, labor; when you estimate the cost of maintaining Church and State, remember that all this is drawn from the unpaid toil of labor. Capital produces nothing without labor. It is only a means of commanding and undoing it. The man who lives in idleness on his money, is as much a tax upon labor as though he were a town pauper. With his money he draws his means of support as directly from the pocket of labor, in the shape of interests, rents, etc., as he would, being a pauper, draw it out by taxation.

Therefore, when we look at the enormous expenditure of supporting Church and State, of supporting the idle and speculating capitalists, traders, lawyers, priests, vagrants and vagabonds, with which community is plentifully stocked; when we look at the idleness and luxury of the wealthy and fashionable classes, is it surprising that the laborer is poor and oppressed? Is it surprising that he or she must live in a hovel, feed on crusts, clothe themselves with coarse and tattered garments, and sleep on straw? Be it known that all these burdens rest upon the shoulders of the laboring class, and our social system is arranged upon such principles as are calculated to compel him to continue in that position. The Church and State have shaken hands to crush him. Legislation is on the side of capital, and nine-tenths of it is designed to protect and benefit wealth, by giving increased facilities for plundering the laborer. The teachings of science, the inventions of art, are all made efficient means in the hands of capital, to make the rich richer and the poor poorer; so that all inventions by which labor is saved, and which ought to be a blessing, by relieving man from slavish servitude, are converted into the means of making servitude worse.

The truth is, that under our social and commercial system the interests of capital and labor antagonize; and capital being in the ascendant, labor is sacrificed to it. Capital can not prosper without oppressing labor. One portion of society can not get rich without directly or indirectly plundering another portion, and making them poor. They occupy opposite ends of the beam. As one goes up the other must go down; there is but so much wealth produced, and if its products continue in the hands of the laborer, capital is not enriched by it. It must pass

from the hands of the laborer into those of capital, there to be cropped and clipped, and made to yield its per cent. over and above what it costs capital, else it makes the capitalist no wealth.

Hence it must be evident to all, that the adoption of any means by which wealth tends to center in the hands of a few, is pregnant with evil to the laboring mass. The evidence of national and commercial prosperity, as seen in the accumulation of individual wealth, is a bad commentary on the condition of the producing mass. It demonstrates conclusively that a vast amount of the products of labor are being transferred into hands that do not render just equivalents for them; it does not show that labor is idle, but that it is unpaid.

That these things are so can not be denied. That the laborer is plundered by capital and made poor, and then disrespected and despised for his poverty, is as true as heaven. He is thus made the victim of injustice and oppression, and then held in contempt for being a victim. These things are not right, they are not in accordance with the requirements of justice, and they call loudly for reform. But who is to become the reformer, and bear the contempt and scorn and contumely which will be visited upon him if he erects the standard of truth and justice, and lifts up his voice like a trumpet against the oppressors of the poor and weak. The reforms demanded are radical, and extend to the fundamental principles of our social, civil and religious organizations. If he speaks the whole truth, he can not fail to come in contact with much that is respectable in Church and State, and he will be likely to bring upon himself the censures of the priest and politician.

And such censure, in this fashionable age, is well nigh sufficient to crush the boldest and strongest spirit, unless he is sustained by an innate love of that which is just and true, and by a firm and unshaken confidence in God, and a full reliance in his power to make truth mighty, nay omnipotent, in pulling down the strongholds of error and justice, all-powerful in conflict with fraud and oppression. The reformer might go to his work with more courage, could he be sure of the sympathy and co-operation of those for whom he labors. Could he command their attention; could he stimulate them to a patient and thorough in-

vestigation of the nature of the evils demanding reform; could he awaken in him high and holy resolves to do battle for the right and the just and the true, counting it honorable to do and suffer for truth and justice, the task would seem easy.

But upon these things he can not rely for encouragement and support. While he is sure of arousing the indignation and malice of those with whose practices he comes in conflict; while he can not expect the encouragement of a venial, political or religious press; while he is sure of arraying the ignorant, hypocritical and bigoted against him in Church and State—he is not sure of obtaining the co-operation and sympathy of those for whom he risks all worldly prospects of honor, power or place. He would be certain of their sympathy and co-operation, could he command their attention—could he gain their ear while he could make himself understood; but it is said “that falsehood will go a thousand miles while truth is getting on her boots.” The reason is, falsehood has so many more messengers who are interested in circulating falsehoods than truth has in her employ; that on the part of falsehood her carriers are always booted and spurred ready for a start. Thousands are ready to misunderstand, misrepresent, misinterpret, and to impugn the motives of the reformer, so that many who would otherwise lend a listening and willing ear, are induced to turn their backs upon those who would do them good.

But still something ought to be done. The situation of the laborer in the old world admonishes us of what is preparing for him in the new, unless labor is emancipated from capital. The same causes are at work here, and will ultimately produce the same results. Like causes will continue to produce like effects until the “frame of things disjoints.” The Almighty will not change the principles of his government, to suit them to the false positions and relations of men. If labor would be emancipated and blessed, it must come into true relations to the divine government. Until it does this, nothing can save the laborer from injustice and oppression.

“I AM THE WAY.”—Jesus.

THE common idea that Jesus taught religion in its true divine sense, is erroneous. He understood too well the laws of communication to attempt anything so absurd. He taught the way by which man might approach unto the Father, so that he might be “taught of God.” It will do for hirelings to teach men to climb up some other way—to endeavor to attain to a knowledge of divine truth by some other means than by the inspiration of the Spirit; but Jesus of Nazareth was too well instructed of the Father to attempt so fruitless a task.

Herein is to be found one of the great errors of Orthodoxy. Not understanding that divine truth can only be taught by divine inspiration, and that he only can understand it who is in a condition to be divinely inspired, the formalist has endeavored to find the Word of God in books and parchments, and thus teach it to his neighbor. He has appended to these forms of expression, “Thus saith the Lord,” and thus has mistaken the *form* for *truth*, and attempted to teach it to others.

Out of this mistaken idea has arisen the great veneration which men have for authority, which they mistake for a veneration for truth. They worship the form while they perceive not the spirit, and think they are worshiping the spirit. In the same way they mistake the teachings of Jesus for that which was to be attained through obedience to his teachings. They suppose Jesus taught religion, and that the doctrines he taught constituted religion; whereas he only taught them the way by means of which they might attain to that condition where the Holy Ghost—the Spirit of Truth—could make to them the true revelation; and the doctrines he taught were only a portion of those means constituting the way. It was he only, who, hearing his sayings and observ-

ing them, could come to that condition when he could "be taught of God."

Christianity, as taught by Jesus, is not a system of religion; it is not a revelation of divine truth in the soul; but it is a way or means by which man is to be prepared for divine instruction. It is a pointing out of those laws of man's being and action which must be observed and practiced by him who hopes to attain unto eternal life; hence it becomes important that these laws should be known and obeyed, else man can not have the benefits of the Christian system. Therefore, said Jesus, if a man keep the whole law and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." The plain and obvious meaning is, that if you comply with all the essential conditions of receptivity except one, and violate that, you lose the benefit of all the rest; because you can not be made receptive of spiritual or divine truth except upon certain conditions, and those are based upon the fundamental laws of being, and are therefore imperative.

Looking at the life and teachings of Jesus in this light, Christianity becomes a very different thing from that which is looked upon as a revelation of divine truth in and of itself. It at once becomes useful to man, only as he puts it in practice. As its doctrines consist in pointing out the *means* by which, and the *condition* into which, man must come, in order that he may receive spiritual and divine truth, all mere *creedative* Christianity is of no value for redemption and salvation.

Christianity, being designed as a *means* of bringing man into a condition for receiving the gifts and teachings of the Spirit, must be such as is capable of being taught to the natural man; that is, the real doctrines of Jesus must be divested of all supernaturalism; for they consist in telling the natural man what he must be and what he must not be; what he must do and what he must not do, to inherit eternal life. In speaking of *being* and *doing*, or of *condition* and *action*, it describes those conditions and actions which the natural perception and understanding of man can comprehend. Of condition, it tells him to cultivate a spirit of meekness, gentleness and humility; it must be peaceable and pure. Of action, it must hunger and thirst after righteousness, love friends and foes, overcome all envy, malice, hatred, and all

lust and evil desire; and it must abstain from all that defiles the mind, by awakening false, unjust or impure desires, etc.

In this way Jesus proceeded to lay down those plain and simple rules of life, which, if observed, would tend to bring man into a condition receptive of the influence of the Spirit, and by means of which he could become truly instructed in the things pertaining to the divine kingdom.

But whosoever mistakes these plain and simple rules of life, or those doctrines of condition and action which he laid down as essential to be observed, in order that man might be taught of God, has studied Christianity to little purpose; and he who mistakes those rules, etc., for religion itself, and thus attempts teaching another religion, will prove to be a "blind leader of the blind." He will find himself attempting to teach that about which he knows nothing.

The experience of Jesus with his disciples illustrates this point. So far as teaching the way to his attainments was concerned, he had no difficulty. He could make them understand that they were to cultivate a spirit of love and kindness; that they were not to smite back when smitten; that they were to be meek, gentle and pure, etc.; but he could not make them understand the nature of the kingdom of heaven; he could not communicate to them the doctrines of that kingdom; he could not make them understand how or when it was to come. These things could only be communicated by the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, the Spirit of Truth. Hence he told them he had many things to communicate, but they could not understand them until the Spirit of Truth should come.

A careful and critical investigation of the teachings of Jesus will demonstrate the truth of the position, that his system was offered to the world only as a means by which man could attain unto the true teachings of the Spirit. This was evidently the view which Paul himself, during the latter years of his ministry, took of the subject. In his letter to the Hebrews he commented largely upon the *first* and *second* covenants, or the *natural* and *spiritual* dispensations, typified by Moses and Jesus. The *first* was purely *external*, communicated by an *external* language, regulating the *external* relations of man, and controlling him by an

external or physical force. As such its laws were to be found recorded on tables and parchments, and taught by men. It had an earthly tabernacle and sanctuary, with an external form, ceremony and ritual.

The *second* covenant which the Lord was to establish was of a very different character. It was altogether spiritual. Its ministry was to be one "of the sanctuary and of the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man;" and of this *new* or *second* covenant Paul thus speaks, quoting from the Prophets: "For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord. I will put my laws into their minds (understandings), and write them in their hearts (affections), and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people; and they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, know ye the Lord, for all shall know me, from the least to the greatest."

Under the *first* covenant or dispensation, external teachers were useful and necessary, because that which was to be taught was external; but under the *second* the subject could only be taught by the Spirit, that is, by inspiration—"And they shall all be taught of God."

The teachings of Jesus having respect to the way or means by which the disciple was to be unfolded in the spiritual and divine of his nature, in order that he might become the subject of spiritual and divine inspiration, and might thus become a medium for spiritual manifestations, it followed, as a necessary consequence, that the reception and practice of his doctrines would be attended by the "gifts of the Spirit," and that those who possessed none of these gifts could furnish no outward sign of discipleship. Hence the doctrine, "These signs shall follow them that believe," naming certain spiritual gifts; also, "Whosoever heareth my sayings and doeth them, the works that I do shall he do," etc.

There are different forms of spiritual manifestations, according to the character and condition of the medium—those which are *external* and *physical*, and those which are *internal* and *inspirational*; and these forms of manifestation are suited to different conditioned minds. There are degrees of elevation and dignity

to them according as they are suited to the communication of higher truths and purer affections. They correspond to the different members of the human body, each necessary and useful in its sphere, and altogether composing one body.

This has been so in every age of the world, and will continue to be so as long as there are different degrees of understanding and purity of affection in the universe; and as that will continue until creations, formations and progressions cease, we may continue to look for this diversity of gifts. The same principle which gave to one the spirit of prophecy, to another the gift of tongues, to another the gift of healing, etc., in the days of Paul, continues still, and will be manifested by the same diversity.

Those who have converted Christianity to a creed in faith, and have embodied in it religious forms and ceremonies in practice, do not possess the gifts of the Spirit, simply because they have not followed the way (Jesus) by which those gifts were to be attained. They have not believed in him as "the way" to attain unto these gifts; they have not kept his sayings, and consequently they have not attained unto the benefits of his system; they have not brought themselves within the promise, for that was only to those who "*kept his sayings.*"

Orthodoxy itself admits its own recreancy in character. It does not profess to be obedient to the teachings of Jesus. It affirms an almost infinite remove of condition from that of Jesus. It goes further; it affirms the impossibility of full or perfect obedience, and pleads the total and inborn depravity of the heart as its excuse, trusting that faith in the merits of Christ will make up the deficiency. Nothing can be more false and unphilosophical than such a faith. The bestowal of the Spirit without measure upon Jesus, was owing to his receptivity through the character to which he had attained by obedience. Had he not attained to that condition, he could not have received so abundantly. "God is no respecter of persons." He is as ready to bestow upon one as another. The only condition demanded is receptivity, and that depends upon unfoldment.

The Orthodox, then, who deny to themselves the necessary unfoldment, by so doing deny to themselves the only condition upon which salvation can come to them. They are laying other

foundations for redemption than that which Jesus laid. They are trying to climb up some other way—to enter into heaven by some other means. For this reason it is that they do not possess the promised gifts, because they have not attained to the necessary character; and they have not attained to that character, because they have not believed in and practiced the teachings of Jesus as constituting "THE WAY."

Christianity, as a means of unfolding in man a spiritual susceptibility, is a very different thing from that false and ideal system called Christianity, which is exalted above everything that is called God, and is worshiped as an idol by pomp, parade and show. Examined in this light, that which now passes for Christianity is most false and pernicious. It occupies the same position, in respect to true religion, as did the doctrines of the Scribes and Pharisees in the days of Jesus; and if it was true *then* that the publicans and harlots were in a more favorable condition for the reception of the truths of the kingdom than *they* were, so is it now. There is no form of infidelity or paganism farther removed from the spirit of Jesus and the genius of his teachings, than is the fashionable orthodoxy of the day. The system of doctrines taught by them as constituting true Christianity, is utterly opposed to the proper unfolding in man, of spiritual and divine susceptibility; and they act consistently with their system when they teach that the age of inspiration is past. But their system will have no true resemblance to the system taught by Jesus, until, according to the laws of man's spiritual nature, it shall become "the way" for unfolding his spiritual faculties and susceptibilities, by means of which he can become instructed in the things of the spiritual and divine kingdom.

CLAIRVOYANCE FROM DELEUZE.

IN Pliny's Natural History we read the following:

"We read in Chronicles that the ghost of Hermotimus Clazomenius was accustomed to abandon his body for a time, and wandering up and down in far countries, used to bring home news from remote places of such things as could not possibly be known, unless it had been present there; and all the while his body lay, as it were, half dead in a trance. This practice it continued so long, that at last the Cantharidæ, who were his mortal enemies, took his body and burned it to ashes, and by that means disappointed his poor soul when it came back again, of that sheath, as it were, or case, where she meant to bestow herself. *Pliny, B. 7, C. 2.*

The history of the past is full of instances of the temporary separation of the mind from the body, by means of which the mind becomes cognizant of things beyond the reach of physical sensation. These things demonstrate the existence of this spiritual faculty, by means of which we can see without the physical eye, hear without the physical ear, and touch without the physical feel. To illustrate this point, we publish the following letter from the Rev. Mr. Kent to Mr. T. C. Hartshorn. The letter is dated Roxbury, Nov. 27, 1837, and is found in the appendix of a work entitled "PRACTICAL INSTRUCTIONS IN ANIMAL MAGNETISM," by J. P. F. Deleuze.

FROM THE REV. MR. KENT.

"MR. T. C. HARTSHORN:

ROXBURY, Nov. 27, 1837.

"Dear Sir—I shall give you a simple narrative of what passed in my presence, on the evening when Miss Brackett was put into

the magnetic sleep and conducted to my place of residence in Roxbury, *as the facts appeared to me*, leaving you to make such a use of it as you may think proper, and others to draw whatever inferences from it they please. If charged with too great minuteness, I will only say that my desire and purpose is to state *the whole truth*, without coloring or reservation.

"Intending to visit the Mansfield mines in my August vacation, I was induced by friends in Boston, who had recently witnessed the powers of different somnambulists, to go on to Providence and seek an opportunity to see them myself. One of these friends kindly obtained for me the letter of introduction presented to you by me from your brother in Boston, in which he simply mentioned my being '*a brother teacher*,' and one anxious to see the effects of animal magnetism from other motives than those of mere curiosity. Not a syllable was said, and I am sure no one could have conjectured about the objects I should wish to have described, and which were described by Miss Brackett with a promptness, accuracy and particularity which amazed me. You must remember also, that in the course of my conversation with you, I had avowed myself, as I really was before trial, a skeptic on the whole subject, to be reclaimed only by evidence which should seem to me irresistible, and a determination to watch, with the closest scrutiny, every circumstance, look and movement that might pass before me; and I distinctly remember that this was also your evidently sincere and repeatedly expressed desire.

"Meeting accidentally with my friend, Mr. Joseph Harrington, Jr., of this place, who assured me of his strong desire to witness an exhibition of somnambulic clairvoyance, if it existed, I requested, in your presence, the privilege of having him accompany me, which Mr. Metcalf, at whose house Miss B. was then residing, very kindly and politely granted. After calling with Mr. Harrington on Dr. Capron, the magnetizer, stating the motive which led me to wait on him and solicit the favor of seeing his patient in the magnetic sleep, and having the hour fixed upon, we went to Mr. Metcalf's at half-past 7 P. M., and were introduced to Miss Brackett. Dr. Capron soon came in, with several other gentlemen and ladies, who were successively introduced,

and in a few minutes he proposed to commence the process of magnetizing, after I had placed a rocking-chair where I pleased, and Miss B. had been led to it, in the perfect attitude of blindness by Miss Metcalf.

"In order to prevent unfairness or collusion between the parties, I requested that lamps might be placed near, and directly before, Miss B., and took my seat at her side. Dr. Capron readily complied with my request, but said that, as her eyes were still, as they had been for several days, inflamed, it would be necessary to put a bandage or cotton before them, to prevent the effects of too strong a light. I proposed the latter; it was brought, and in our presence rolled into balls, and inserted between the spectacles she wore and her eyes, in such a manner that *it would have been impossible for her, even with the best eyes, to see a ray of light.* This cotton was watched, and *it remained in its place through the whole time.* Of the process of magnetizing I will only mention one or two phenomena which I have not seen stated. After Miss Brackett was apparently in a profound sleep, Dr. Capron requested us to observe the effect of pointing his fingers toward, but without touching, by several inches, her hand. At first her arm and hand were gently agitated, the agitation increasing as his fingers approached, until her hand was drawn or attracted with violence up to the magnetizer's. The experiment was repeatedly tried on the right and left hands, *according to our direction, in every instance successfully, and with the same result,* without a word spoken or sign given which could have indicated which hand would be approached. We were then requested to try the same experiment ourselves, and did so without the least effect.

"On being roused by Dr. Capron, Miss Brackett instantly started from her chair, and to our astonishment passed twice round the room with a rapid and sure step, avoiding every individual and article of furniture, and saying that she "could not and would not stay where there were so many people." She then hurried through the parlor to the door of the entry, seized its handle instantly and unerringly, and turning her face toward us, opened it and gained the outer step, where Dr. Capron took her arm, and persuading her to return, seated her in the chair

she had left, when she was again introduced to all the strangers present; the first introduction having been made while she was in her natural state, the last while in the magnetic sleep.

"Dr. Capron then requested a tumbler of water to be brought, and after drinking about half of it himself, he roused Miss B., who had apparently sunk into a profound and quiet sleep, as she afterward did repeatedly, and requested her to drink some of it. She did so, when Mr. Harrington drew to a corner of the room, and after writing on a slip of paper, beckoned me to him, and simply held the paper before me, on which was written, '*Will the contents of the tumbler to be castor oil?*' or words to that effect. He then beckoned to Dr. Capron, who went to him, and reading the sentence, indicated by a nod that he would cheerfully do it, and re-taking his seat, which was placed between two and three feet before Miss Brackett, he said, without moving a limb or uttering a syllable more:

"'Come, Lurena, drink a little of this, and you will feel better, I think,' alluding, as I supposed, to a severe headache, of which she had spoken to us in the course of our conversation, before the doctor's entrance.

"She raised the tumbler to her lips, and suddenly replaced it in her lap with evident nausea and aversion.

"Dr. C. 'Come, drink a little of it. It is very good.'

"Miss B. 'Good!' moving her lips; 'you know it is not good.'

"Dr. C. 'Why?'

"Miss B. 'Why? It makes me sick.'

"Dr. C. 'O, no; drink one mouthful.'

"She did so; and had she witnessed the ceremony of taking pure castor a thousand times, the apparent effect on her could not have been more true to nature.

"Mr. Harrington again summoned the doctor, and whispered, too low to be heard by any other person in the room, '*Will, now, that it is snuff?*' He returned, and repeated only words resembling those used in the first experiment. On looking into the tumbler, she seemed to smile ironically, and said:

"*Drink this! drink this! you know I can not,*' with an expression of countenance which any one, seeing snuff to be the contents of a tumbler about to be drank off, must have assumed.

"I then requested Dr. C., in the same manner, to *will it to be pleasant lemonade.*" After long persuasion, without a word or gesture, however, which could have indicated the nature of my request on Dr. C.'s part, she put the tumbler cautiously to her lips, and tasting, drank the whole of the water that remained.

"Dr. C. 'Well, Lurena, how do you like that?'

"Miss B. 'Why, it's very good, but a little too sour.'

"Some one of the strangers present now requested in a whisper, that he would '*will the tumbler to be filled with an ice-cream.*' I sat at Miss B.'s elbow, and watched both her countenance and Dr. C.'s words and motions. Collusion, or anything like a secret understanding between them in what followed, *I believe to have been impossible.*

"Dr. C. 'Come, Lurena, drink what I have got for you now. You will find it very good.'

"Rousing, she looked into the empty tumbler, and continued silent. On further inquiry, she said :

"'You know I can not drink it.'

"Dr. C. 'Why?'

"Miss B. 'I've been waiting for a spoon this half hour.'

"A spoon was then brought and given her. She raised the tumbler, and imitating to perfection the manner of a lady taking an ice-cream in a fashionable and elegant circle, she finished it and replaced the tumbler in her lap, as one waiting for a servant to take it.

"Dr. C. 'Well, is not that good?'

"Miss B. 'Yes, it's very good, but a little too highly flavored for me.'

"I should have mentioned that, while eating it, she put her hand to her face in apparent pain.

"Dr. C. 'What is the matter with your face?'

"Miss B. 'Why, it makes my teeth ache, it's so cold.'

"I then requested Dr. Capron to take the tumbler from her, and in a whisper scarcely audible to him, to '*will a black kitten to be in her lap.*' He assented, and, taking his seat before her, as I did mine at her side, he said, without previously uttering a syllable, even in whisper, to any one, or making the least motion, 'Lurena, come, wake up and see what you have in your lap.'

She seemed gradually to wake. 'What have you in your lap?' Looking down, she instantly began to draw her arms up with aversion at the object seen, but remained silent.

"Dr. C. 'What is the matter? Is it not pretty?'

"Drawing her arms still farther up, she said, evidently offended, 'Pretty? no. What have you put *that* in my lap for? I shan't take it! I won't!'

"Dr. C. 'O yes, take it.'

"Miss B. 'I won't.'

"Dr. C. 'Well, if you do not like it, give it to me.' Lifting it precisely as one would by the nape of the neck, and tossing it, she said, 'There, take the dirty black thing!'

"The preceding experiments were tried in consequence of our having heard that similar ones had been made without failure in any instance; and I am as certain as I am of being able to see or hear anything directly before me, that no direction, either by a whisper, pause or gesture, was given by the magnetizer to the magnetized; and I know that the directions I gave Dr. C. could not have been anticipated by him or any one else.

"I now requested Dr. Capron to take her to Roxbury, and to 'stop in front of the Universalist meeting-house at the bottom of the hill,' as the nearest prominent object to my own house.

"Dr. C. 'Well, Lurena, Mr. Kent wishes us to go to Roxbury and visit his house. Will you go?'

"Miss B. 'Yes, I should like to go very well.'

"Dr. C. 'In what way shall we go?'

"Miss B. 'We will go through the air, if you please, and I should like to go high.'

"Dr. C., at some one's suggestion. 'Why do you wish to go high?'

"Miss B. 'Why, to avoid the steeples and trees that will be in our way.'

"The appearance manifested on her passage from place to place has been correctly described by others. In about one and a half minutes, Dr. C. said:

"Well, Lurena, have we got there?"

"Miss B. 'Yes, we have;' with an appearance of exhaustion.

"At this moment Dr. Capron proposed to put me in communi

cation with her, as he had engagements to attend to at the hour arrived. I requested, however, that I might first see you take the guidance of her, as I was wholly ignorant of the manner of it. Dr. C. mentioned that this might be as well, and introduced you.

"*Mr. H.* 'Miss Brackett, how do you do? I am very happy to meet you in Roxbury.'

"*Miss B.* 'Why, Mr. Hartshorn, how came you to be here?'

"*Mr. H.* 'I am here on a visit.'

"You were *not* in the room when all present were led up and mentioned or introduced after she was magnetized. Mr. Harrington now requested you to ask her what she saw.

"*Mr. H.* 'Well, Miss Brackett, what building have we here?'

"*Miss B.* 'Why do you ask that question? You can see for yourself as well as I can.'

"*Mr. H.* 'Yes, but I should like to know how we agree.'

"*Miss B.* 'Why, it is a large meeting-house.'

"*Mr. H.* 'Well, look round, look up; what o'clock is it?'

"*Miss B.*, after apparent examination. '*It has no clock.*' This is correct.

"*Mr. H.* 'What do you see? Are there any lights?'

"'Yes, there are; and what strange people they are in Roxbury, to have lights on posts in the day-time! If I could only reach higher I would take them down, it looks so silly.'

"Mr. Harrington now directed you to ask what she saw before the meeting-house.

"*Miss B.* 'I see a building.'

"*Mr. H.* 'What sort of a building is it?'

"*Miss B.* 'It is a brick one.' Correct.

"*Mr. H.*, at Mr. Harrington's suggestion. 'Now, Miss Brackett, we will go to this building. Are we there?'

"*Miss B.* 'Yes, we are.'

"*Mr. H.* 'Well, should you like to go in and see what there may be there?'

"*Miss B.* 'I should.'

"*Mr. H.*, after a moment's pause. 'What do you see?'

"*Miss B.* 'O, how beautiful these are! How good they taste!' She then appeared to eat some kind of fruit, but suddenly stop-

ping, said, 'O, I forgot, I have no money, sir; I beg your pardon;' and apparently laid down what she held in her hand.

"*Mr. H.* 'What are you eating, Miss Brackett? Do you wish for money? Here it is.'

"*Miss B.*, smiling with evident pleasure. 'I thank you,' and seeming to take up the fruit again and eat it, said, 'How pleasant it is! It is so good I think I'll take another.' She did so.

"*Mr. H.*, by direction. 'What sort of fruit is it?'

"*Miss B.*, 'I don't hardly know. They are apples or pears. They *taste* very good.'

"*Mr. H.* 'Well, Miss Bracket, look round and see what else you may like. It will refresh you to take something after your rapid journey.' In a few moments, putting her left hand under the chin, she seemed like one attempting to crack a hard-shelled nut with the teeth.

"*Mr. H.* 'What have you there?'

"*Miss B.* 'Why, it's a *Castalia* nut, and so hard that I can't crack it,' trying with still greater effort.

"*Mr. H.* '*Castalia* nut? You mean, do you not, the *Castana* nut?'

"*Miss B.* 'Yes; I don't know what *you* call it, but *I* call it a *Castalia* nut.'

"*Mr. H.* 'Well, shall we go now?'

"*Miss B.* 'If you please. But, O, I havn't paid the gentleman. There, sir,' laying, as it were, money upon a counter.

"The building where this imaginary scene passed is a brick one, occupied at present as a West India goods store. The day after my return from Providence, I called at this store and inquired, first, whether the storekeeper had any fruit for sale on Wednesday evening. He replied in the affirmative, and directed me to a basket of apples which he said had been on the counter three or four days. On tasting one, I certainly should not have doubted the correctness of *Miss B.*'s *taste*, had she been present, when she seemed to enjoy them so much in imagination. 'Have you any *Castana* nuts?' 'You will find them in the window next to the door.' *They were there in one of the three divisions of a box, containing different kinds of nuts.*

"At the door of the store you will remember having put me in communication with her.

"*Mr. H.* 'Miss Brackett, here is our mutual friend, Mr. Kent, who was introduced to you in Providence.'

"'Good evening, Miss Brackett; I am very glad to see you in Roxbury,' taking her hand.

"*Miss B.* 'Why, Mr. Kent, how did you get here so soon?' with apparent surprise and emphasis.

"'I followed you in the railroad cars.'

"*Miss B.* 'In the cars! That is impossible! You could not travel so fast in the cars as I did through the air.'

"'Well, suppose, then, that I came in the stage.'

"*Miss B.* 'In the stage! You have just said you came in the cars! *Your stories do not seem to hang together,*' smiling.

"'I confess, Miss Brackett, that I can not tell you *how* I came; but that is of no consequence, it is certain I am *here*, and wish you to go with me to my house, a short distance from this. Will you attend me?'

"*Miss B.* 'Yes, sir, I will.'

"After a time sufficient to conduct her only a few steps, and giving two or three directions, I said, 'Stop, we must go back and start again. I believe I am wrong.' She laughed audibly. 'What are you laughing at, Miss Brackett?'

"*Miss B.* 'Why, I am laughing at the fact that you, a gentleman, should invite me to attend you to your house, *when you don't know the way there yourself!*' I cheerfully confess, sir, that my feelings at this moment, in consequence of what I had witnessed and heard after her arrival in Roxbury, very much resembled those of an oratorical tyro who has lost the place in his manuscript, and stands before an audience evidently waiting for words which it is not in his power to command, utterly at fault! I did not feel certain that I should select such landmarks, and use such terms as would be *sure* to guide *such a companion* to the house, and said, 'I am very free to acknowledge, Miss Brackett, that you may have a better guide under my direction, and here is our friend Mr. Hartshorn, who will take you in charge.'

"*Mr. H.* 'Will you go with *me* to Mr. Kent's?'

"Miss B., with evident pleasantry. 'I will; for he does not seem to know the way there himself!'

"Mr. H., by direction. 'We are now at the first corner on the right, Miss Brackett. What do you see?'

"Miss B. 'See? A large brick house.'

"Mr. H. 'Is it a tavern?'

"Miss B. 'It may be; I think it is.'

"Mr. H. 'We will go forward a little. What do you see?'

"Miss B., after a pause. 'I shall not tell you, for you can see it yourself.'

"Mr. H. 'I wish to see whether we agree in opinion.'

"Miss B. 'It's a very large barn. The stable by which she must pass measures ninety feet by thirty-two.'

"Mr. H. 'Is there anything on the top of it? Look up.'

"Miss B., after looking up. 'Why, what curious people there are here! They keep lamps on posts burning in the daytime, and put creatures on their barns.' There is on this livery stable an unusually large gilded vane in the form of a horse.

"Mr. H. 'We will now go forward, cross a street, and on the left-hand corner is Mr. Kent's house.' After a short pause, 'Are we there?'

"Miss B. 'Yes.'

"Mr. H. 'What is there before his house?'

"Miss B. 'I shan't tell you, for you know.'

"Mr. H. 'O, yes, tell me. Is there any yard here?' As you had never seen my house, your question was put at random.

"Miss B. 'Yard? Yes.'

"Mr. H. 'What sort of one is it?'

"Miss B. 'Why do you ask such questions?'

"Mr. H. 'Is it a graveled one?'

"Miss B. 'No; it is a green one—you know it is.' She seemed here, as in several other instances, to feel that she was trifled with. Her answer was correct.

"Mr. H. 'Well, we will go in and enter the room on the left. Are we there?'

"Miss B. 'Yes. What a handsome carpet this is!'

"Mr. H., by direction. 'What kind of a carpet is it? Is it Brussels, Kidderminster, or what is it?'

"*Miss B.* 'I hardly know what to call it. It's a very handsome one, *but it is not woolen.*' The carpet is a painted canvas, one which had been purchased at the factory and laid down a short time before.

"I was here again put in communication with her. 'Well, Miss Brackett, you see me now at home, and I wish you to look round this room, and tell me what you think of the different objects here.'

"*Miss B.*, apparently looking at the wall. 'O, what a beautiful picture this is! It would be perfect if the hair of the lady was pushed a little farther back. It comes too low over the forehead.' Speaking in a whisper to herself, 'O, what hair, it spoils it. I wish I could push it back;' motioning with her fingers as if attempting to do so. 'How beautiful that arm is!' The picture described is a Chinese copy of a lady holding a kitten in her arms, and hangs nearest the door. Although it has been there three years, I was unconscious of any striking defect in the hair, but found on my return that no artist, with perfect eyes and the most discriminating taste, could have made more just criticism upon it than she did. Her remark upon the arm was precisely the same in words that I have repeatedly heard made by others.

"'We will now, Miss Brackett, pass on, if you please. What do you see here?'

"*Miss B.* 'See! What you see, sir—a table.'

"'Is there anything over it?'

"*Miss B.* 'O, that lady is perfect. How beautiful she is!' with earnest emphasis. The painting over the table is a Chinese copy, also, of the 'Maid of Athens,' and was correctly described.

"'Is there anything on this table?'

"*Miss B.* 'Yes, and they are the handsomest of the kind I ever saw. How very beautiful these are! I *must* look into one of them.'

"'Well, Miss Brackett, open and look into it.'

"*Miss B.*, seeming to make an unsuccessful attempt. 'I can't; it is locked.'

"At your suggestion. 'You can look through the top of it.'

"*Miss B.* "No; I want the key. I shall not look through the cover of such a one as this is."

"' Well, here is the key,' putting the ends of my fingers to hers.

"*Miss B.*, trying it and handing it back again. 'It does not fit.'

"' O, I have given you the wrong one. *This is the key.*'

"*Miss B.*, holding it up and looking at it with a smile. 'What a pretty, cunning little key this is! I never saw one of such a color.' Inserting and carefully turning it, she opened the box, and seemed to admire the inside. There were on the table two Chinese work-boxes, having the usual pieces within, and, what I believe is not common, a very beautiful cluster of flowers painted on white satin in the cover of each, with a third, resembling them in external appearance. The key was described with amusing and singular accuracy, and I found on my return that Mrs. K. had locked the outside work-box, in compliance with our agreement before I left home, that she should make what striking alterations, unknown to me and every one else, in my room, she pleased. I, in a few moments, asked what else she saw on the table, *having in my own mind a large book of paintings on rice paper, which I remembered leaving on this table before the work-boxes*, of whose merits I was curious to learn her opinion. She smiled, but would make no reply.

"' I wish you now to look at the fire-place. Is there anything before it?'

"*Miss B.* 'Yes. O, what a singular and splendid urn that is! I never saw one so large, and of such a color.'

"' What is its color?'

"*Miss B.* 'I don't know what color to call it,' speaking in an undertone. 'It looks white—red.' The urn standing there was a large one, of polished variegated porphyry.

"' Now, Miss Brackett, look over the mantel-piece—look high. Is there anything there?'

"*Miss B.*, speaking with evident emotion and veneration. 'O, how beautiful—beautiful! And as she spoke she bent forward, folded her arms on her breast, and put herself exactly in the attitude of our Savior, as he is painted in a miniature which rep-

resents him at the moment when he said, 'Thy will be done.' This painting is on ivory, three inches square in the clear, set in a deep and broad gilt frame, and hangs about one and a half feet over the mantel-piece. It was received from Canton, and placed there but a few days before, and *I know that no individual in America, except my family, had then seen it.* I continued:—

" 'What do you see, Miss Brackett?'

" *Miss B.*, raising her eyes. ' What a beautiful picture that is! '

" 'Is it a large one?'

" *Miss B.* ' No, it's a very small one. It's too small.'

" 'Is it as small as the one opposite?'

" *Miss B.* ' Yes; why, you know it is as small again.' Correct.

" 'Well, look down; is there anything under it?'

" *Miss B.* ' You know there is.'

" 'What is it?'

" *Miss B.*, promptly. ' *It's an image of Christ.*' There was, standing directly under the picture, a cast-iron image of our Saviour bearing his cross, in bas-relief.

" 'What more do you see here?'

" *Miss B.* ' What large and beautiful vases these are!'

" 'Vases! How many are there?'

" *Miss B.* ' Why, you can see as well as I do. There are two.' There were *four* glass shades, or vases, covering large specimens of Chinese rice-paper flowers; two of them touching each other at each end of a long and broad mantel-piece.

" 'We will now, if you please, go into the other room, and see what may be there.'

" *Miss B.* ' Stop a moment, I want to rest me on this sofa; my head aches.' A sofa stands between the fire-place and door by which she would naturally pass.

" In a few moments. ' Will you go now?'

" *Miss B.* ' Yes, I will.'

" 'And what do you find in this room?'

" *Miss B.* ' What! are there pictures here, too? But I don't like this room so well as the other.'

" 'You do not? Look round, if you please, and tell me what the pictures are.'

"Miss B. 'Why, I don't know what they are. There is one that looks like an apostle.' *There was no such picture in the room, although there had been but a few days before.* 'O, these are beautiful. O, they are beautiful, very beautiful.'

"'What are they?

"Miss B. 'Why, this book of pictures. Don't you see them?'

"'Where are they?

"Miss B. 'On the piano-forte. But I must go back into the other room. I want to look at the pictures there.' *I found on my return that Mrs. K. had removed this book from the table in the other room, where I left it, to the piano in this room, and in sport placed a coffee-pot in its stead. Whether or not this was the object smiled at but not mentioned, I leave others to decide.* Returning with my charge to the other room, I requested Dr. Capron, who had now come in, to receive her from me. He did so, and after indulging her in looking at the pictures a short time, on which she made the same remarks as before, he said:

"'Well, Lurena, Mr. Kent wishes us now to go up stairs. Will you go?'

"Miss B. 'Yea, I will.'

"Dr. C. 'We will go up and enter the left-hand door.'

"'What do you see here?'

"Miss B. 'See! I see a lady.'

"Dr. C. 'How is she dressed?' Her answer was correct.

"'How old is she?'

"Miss B. 'Why, that is a polite question! Madam,' bowing and smiling as she spoke, '*the gentleman wishes me to ask you how old you are!*'

"Dr. C. 'How old do you think she is?'

"Miss B., raising her eyes. 'I don't know. I should think she is about twenty.'

"Dr. C. 'Are there any other persons in the room?'

"Miss B. 'No.' *Mrs. K. was the only person up in the chamber, at the time. There were, however, two children asleep in the bed.*

"Dr. C. 'We will now go forward and down stairs, and pass through the left-hand door.'

"'What sort of room is it?'

"*Miss B.* 'It's a large kitchen.' Correct. In a short time she seemed to be sipping something.

"*Dr. C.* 'What have you found, Lurena? anything to eat?'

"*Miss B.* 'Eat! no. It's water, and very good water, too.' There is in the corner of this kitchen a small table, on which my cook keeps habitually a water-pail, and generally a long-handled tin dipper in it. On my return, I inquired of her if she remembered certainly whether there was water left in the pail on the evening mentioned. She replied that she was certain of having left it more than half full, in consequence of finding more water in the boiler than she expected on that evening. This pail, however, I found, without letting any one know the object of my examination, to be left empty when my domestics retired, four nights in succession! I now directed Dr. Capron to take her into the next apartment, 'the pump-room, with a lattice front,' *forgetting, in my astonishment at what had passed before me, that there was an intermediate room.*

"*Dr. C.* 'Well, we will now go into the next room. What sort of room is it?'

"*Miss B.* 'Why, this is a kitchen, too, only it's a smaller one.' Correct.

"*Dr. C.* 'We will go through the next one, and take the left-hand door into another room. Are we there?'

"*Miss B.* 'Yes, but,' with evident surprise, '*why did they tell me Mr. Kent was a minister?* It isn't true. He's a schoolmaster!' Dr. C. looked at me, and appeared, at least, to believe that his patient was here at fault. You will remember having assured me, sir, on the evening when we separated before the Franklin House in Providence, that you had mentioned me, both to Miss Brackett and Dr. Capron, *only as a minister.* On my stating to the latter that, although *I had been a minister*, she was correct, he said, 'A schoolmaster, Lurena? Why do you say he is a schoolmaster?'

"*Miss B.* 'Why, you say this is his room, and he is a schoolmaster because this is a school-room. And I never saw such a one. He has pictures here, too. And what singular desks these are! He has chairs fixed instead of seats.' It would have been impossible for a person with perfect eyes, and in broad sun-light, to

give a more accurate description of this room than she did. I could not at this moment repress my impatience to have her conducted to the room above, the character and contents of which, I am sure, could be known neither to yourself, to Dr. Capron, to Miss Brackett, nor to any one else in Providence except Mr. Harrington, *who had been totally silent on the subject*, from the fact that I had myself scrupulously guarded against giving the least hint of them to any one, that less than three days had elapsed since my letter of introduction to you was written, that I was a perfect stranger to your brother in Boston, who penned it, and that to entertain a moment's suspicion of collusion between him and the gentleman who obtained it for me, by which any intelligence of the truth might have been secretly communicated, would be a gross and unpardonable insult to unimpeachable integrity.

‘Dr. C. at length said, ‘Come, Lurena, *we will now go out of this room*, and up stairs into the room above, which Mr. Kent wishes us to see. Will you go?’

“Miss B. ‘Stop; I can’t go up yet. I must sit down in this chair and rest me; my head aches.’

“Dr. C. ‘Well, sit down; we need not be in haste.’ He then made a few motions with the hands before her, after which she soon roused, and said, in reply to his invitation, ‘I don’t want to go up these stairs.’

“Dr. C. ‘Why?’

“Miss B. ‘Because they are so steep and twisting.’ Apparently making an effort, ‘They are the hardest stairs I ever went up.’ The stairs leading to the room above are in one corner of the school-room, *not out of it*; are ‘steep and twisting,’ and have more than once occasioned in others the same complaint while ascending them.

“Dr. C. ‘Are you in the room?’

“Miss B. ‘Yes. Why, is it possible? What a singular man Mr. Kent is! He is a minister and a schoolmaster, *and keeps a museum*. I must see all these things. I could stay here four or five days, yes, a month. How many things there are!’ While she appeared to examine objects, I requested Dr. C. to question her in relation to what she saw. He did so.

"*Miss B.* 'Why, what a curious window that is! I never saw one before that went clear across a room! And only look! He has got it full behind the windows, too. What large things! The glass seems to magnify them.' My astonishment was at this moment complete. *There is a glass window or partition across the room to secure my apparatus, and several large articles connected with natural history.*

"*Dr. C.* 'What now do you see? Look up.'

"*Miss B.* 'Why, that is very handsome.'

"*Dr. C.* 'What is it?'

"*Miss B.* 'It looks like marble.' Alluding, as I supposed, to a bust of plaster of Paris, standing on a pedestal against the partition.

"*Dr. C.* 'Are there any shells here?'

"*Miss B.* 'Why do you ask me that question, when you know I have just put one into your hand?' *There were shells within her reach.* After she had seemed to examine the different objects around with the different sensations which they were adapted to produce, I requested Dr. C. to take her to a friend's house in this place; but she refused decidedly to go, saying she would leave this room to see no other one in Roxbury. She was then charged to remember some of the things, with a view to having them described the next day, assured that she might return to look at my cabinets when, and stay as long as, she pleased.

"Reconducted to Providence in the same manner as she came to Roxbury, and re-entering the room at Mr. Metcalf's, she instantly said, 'Why, there are two gentlemen here to whom I have not been introduced!' It was acknowledged, and she was introduced to these gentlemen, strangers from a distant State, who had entered the room between her leaving and returning to Providence.

"In eight or ten days after, the parents of Mr. Harrington called upon me and expressed a wish to see my cabinets, saying that they had received a letter from him (he had not yet returned home), mentioning that Miss Brackett had returned to them, and spent the night in examination after being put into the magnetic sleep; that she had described to Miss Metcalf, the next day, certain objects which he mentioned, but which they had decided not

to name until they had seen for themselves. We went to the room, where they found every object Mr. H. had specified in his letter—a bust of Milton, a large table in the center of the room, several pictures scattered on one side of it, which belong to a perspective box, and a box covered with paper, which strikingly resembles what Miss Brackett said it was, '*something like Mosaic work.*' I could not account for her recognition of Milton's bust, seen, as it was, in a teacher's room or 'museum,' where any other than this would be likely to have place, until I found, on being requested by a gentleman to examine it, what I had forgotten, the name, 'Milton,' written deeply and legibly on the back of it, which touched a board partition.

"I am aware, sir, that there may seem to be indelicacy in thus exposing to the public the objects to be found in a private dwelling, and I would, if I could, have avoided it. But I promised, at the moment of leaving you, to describe and place at your disposal an account of what I saw and heard. It is right to keep that promise; and in doing this I have felt obliged to give literally the questions asked and answers returned. *You have, according to my best recollection, the whole truth, without reservation or intentional coloring.* The facts, as they appeared to me, are at your disposal. With the inferences to be drawn from them I have nothing here to do, and cheerfully leave the subject with those who may think it worthy either of their ridicule or serious consideration, calmly and humbly asking for myself, '*What shall we do with these things?*'

"Yours, very respectfully and truly,

"BENJAMIN KENT."

THE RECONCILIATION OF MANKIND THROUGH MEDIATION.

BY LOVE M. WHITCOMB.

As no doctrine of theology has been accepted by man, except through the demand of his nature, so all must contain more or less of truth in order to be received by him, the amount depending more upon his interpretation than upon the doctrine. The belief in a necessary mediation between God and man finds its source in man's consciousness of a condition not at-one with God. The aspirations being the central impulse of the soul, they give an expression to all the developments of soul life. To aspire unto a condition above the present is not an acquired virtue but a natural instinct, the law of life, which, in all forms and all expressions, tends upward by entering new relations, and that tendency gives birth to what we term effort. Aspiration is the un-formed effort of progress. The seed by its aspiration sprouts, grows and becomes a perfect plant. It is the law of its life. Its aspirations express themselves in each new-formed twig and leaf. The moisture aspires to a higher degree of life, and unites itself with the various forms of matter, and answering the aspirations of other life, becomes itself capable of new manifestations of desire, and thus, through all the forms of matter the law is single, and the expression of it perfect.

The union of all life may be traced by man downward, since he can not perceive the laws of higher forms than those he has attained unto, except through those he perceives at work in himself. Each revealment of science proves the unbroken chain that connects the three kingdoms of animal, vegetable and mineral, and the union between all and man. The higher intuitions of the soul reaching upward, make him to know the chain is

not broken here. Still onward is the law, and that which he can not yet perceive, he aspires unto through the law of his being.

Life having become individualized, concentrates its aspirations, and they become revealed unto the understanding. *Man knows* a something beyond himself; a thrill from the Divine reaches his inmost being, and the intuitive answer, "Here am I, Lord," proclaims unto him his destiny. He would attain unto it. "Oh that I might come into his presence!" As surely as he perceives this desire, so surely he feels himself afar off. The Divine is in his soul, but is not his *whole life*; the harmony is not there. Some chord responds at the touch of the master-hand, but through the sevenfold chords perhaps but one will give the answering vibration. Who shall make music of this discord? There must be found some hand to attune. Something is between the aspiration and the aspired-for; *that* must be the medium, *that* must be the revelator. Now this necessity comes from the want of the soul; it is right; it is by its law. But when life has become individualized and is conscious spirit, it gives *form* to its desire to correspond with its own self. Its mediator, then, is not its divine aspiration searching unto its highest, but becomes limited by its power of concentrating its own self upon an ideal. The aspirations of the less advanced races reach not beyond the external, and their mediation is found in wood and stones, in fire and sun. They bow down to worship what is to them an expression of their highest, but it will be found that they worship these not as *the* God, but as the *embodiment* of God. The faint glimmer of light that penetrates their darkness, only reveals the desire which expresses itself in the external; it is sufficient to awaken and stimulate the higher aspiration, but not sufficient to give it expression—that is done by the lower nature answering the call of the higher; therefore the idols of the pagan world meet a want of the soul, and keep alive the kindled light of divinity.

When, however, man began to perceive new forms of expression for his aspiration, he lifted himself through those higher forms. Yet still his desire for a mediator between him and the aspired-for, was felt. In moments of sublime ecstasy, when the

soul rested in its selfhood, the "presence of the Lord" was felt by prophets and magi, and they foresaw a diviner light shining through a diviner form; they perceived the at-one-ment necessary, and through their own highest life knew it must come through the perfected spirit made in the image of God; and when to the race most advanced in a knowledge of divine things came the fulfillment of the prophecy in Jesus of Nazareth, the *way* was manifest. He who through his perfect development attuned his high aspirations unto his life, and found the entrance unto the kingdom of Heaven, became naturally, to his followers and to all who recognized his divine expression of divine harmony, *a mediator*. He had made the celestial harmony respond from his whole being, and knew himself at-one with God. The *word* being the highest revealment of divine truth, the *I am* of the Almighty, he was to the beloved John that word. Perceiving the wondrous life that extended from Jesus through all life, he perceived his *eternity*. He was in the beginning, he was the Alpha and Omega, since God dwelt in him, and the highest of man's aspirations had found expression in his life, and were responded to in his soul. To John, if not to the other disciples, he was the true mediator. He translated the victory of life so that it could be read of all men, but to that disciple who, through his affections, came into nearest relations to him, he was *the light*. His mediation was the revealment of the paternity of God, and the unity of all in him. In that light could the dimness of the present be made glorious, and the future manifest. Gradually, however, the many lost the revelation made to the few. A mediator was still claimed and felt necessary, but its conception grew gross with the grossness of the lives of those who had felt themselves the especial favorites of heaven, and had associated themselves by external compacts, forming the Church, so called, of Christ. The mediator was still the necessity of their conscience, for the divine voice can not be stifled. When it calls, the inmost responds; but when the response comes through the external, then the manifestation will be embodied in the external.

Thus the mediation of Jesus became an external means of attaining unto a desired end, and was no longer the bright and shining light, the same that lighteth every man that cometh into

the world, or he the revelator of its glory and the embodiment of its power. Through the progress of ages the same necessity has proved man's unity of development, and his tenacious adherence to a false faith shows his reliance on what the past has made important. The changes that have merged one nation into another, and disturbed the bounds of sects, have broken down the barriers of settled dogmas. The few now trust what the many trusted. The masses, sustaining new relations to each other, enter their protest against bondage in any form, and doubts take the place of faith. Yet do we find man still seeking a mediatorial power, even in his infidelity to what was formerly relied on. The Church has still its unmeaning, ineffective, insufficient Holy Ghost, that obeys man's will, and yet disregards it—that promises and fulfills not, that is given and taken away, obeying no law and being subject to no decree. It is a dead letter, save in keeping alive an expectation which is the promise of fruition. The churchless many, though rejecting the false hopes of these anxious expectants, yet also find a mediation by which they expect to attain unto holiness, happiness, heaven. A selfish money-getter saves his soul by a few dribbled morsels of charity, making his act his stepping-stone to heaven, his mediation between his selfish lust and his divine instinct or aspiration. The getter of power wields weakly his scepter to bestow a gracious favor, and thus save his soul; something must come between the low, selfish lust and the divine life. There must be some climbing up to this kingdom of righteousness. The mediator must be found between God and man, or between the soul's highest divine life and its low animal desires. The propitiation must be made. Now that which is above becomes always a mediator to that below. The beautiful violet that looks with its clear eye up from the sheltering grass, is the mediator between the hard, cold soil and you. The ethereal essence reaches you, and awakens in you the love of beauty, and makes you rejoice in the delicate perfume. There is a delicate life far more ethereal than the violet's perfume, that becomes unto the lusts and passions the mediator. Listen to its gentle pleadings. It never leaves or forsakes you. When hard and cold, its warm life still penetrates you; it is the divinity—the link to the higher and holier. The animal

nature is allied by it to the spiritual. Do you crucify it? yet will it live again. Place it in the sepulcher, and on the morrow will it rise to commune with you. There is, then, ever this mediator for the soul—this life within its own life. But there is also an external mediation that connects this divine life with still higher forms of life. "All angels form a chain that in God's burning throne begins, and winds down to the lowest plane of earthly minds." As man aspires to a higher possibility, then there comes the life above his life to answer his aspiration. A little above man is the angel. Stooping from that height, he reaches to take hold of the lifted prayer, and still unto greater heights bears it, even unto the Divine. This was the mediation Jesus spoke of when he said, "Greater works than these shall ye do, because I go unto the Father." Having entered the purely spiritual life, he would become unto them strength, and give of his wisdom, power and love unto them. Yet first, must the true mediation take place in their own souls. They must be one with the Divine—must have lifted their lower natures by the spirit of truth and purity, into oneness with the Father or higher life; must have had revealed in themselves *the light*. An external mediator may aid men by awaking in them the slumbering divinity, by rolling away the stone, but still the unity with the Father must be attained in the soul. The desire to reach the kingdom of Heaven by some external means, would seem to reveal the necessity of some external power; yet this is the result of the aspiration which is holy becoming subject unto the more powerful (because so long yielded to) influence of selfish lust. The desire of heaven is often only the desire of self-gratification; to seek it, only to labor for reward; to cast the burden on the Lord only an indolent craving for ease, and not the noblest expression of the soul's filial trust. Yet the declarations, "He bore our infirmities," "Took upon himself our sins," are not without significance. Jesus became a mediator, a Christ, by living the divine life, and by showing unto the world the possibility of that life; yet can he by no means help another to it, save in the manner he attained it, by subjecting every unholy desire, by freeing himself from every slavish chain, and asserting his self-hood through his victory. This victory won, then cometh the

rest, the peace of conquest. "My peace I give unto you; not as the world giveth give I unto you. Oh, ye my beloved ones who at this day toil and suffer, and weep and pray as I wept and prayed, hear my voice; hear the loving words with which I call you unto myself through your noble selfhood, through your perfected manhood and womanhood. As you offer incense unto me, you offer unworthy sacrifice, but as you restrain an evil desire, as you subjugate a false life, as you achieve a conquest over the perverse passions, then *am I with you*, then do I not leave you or forsake you, but within the holy of holies do we dwell, one with the Father, and *do his will in the courts of heaven.*"

PROPOSITION.

THE impulses by which that which is needed for individualization and development is appropriated, are just, within their appropriate sphere of action.

Hence the individuality which, according to the fundamental condition of its being, needs to appropriate to itself certain elements to enable it to attain its highest destiny, is just in making such appropriation, and violates no condition of its nature.

Hence the impulse of self-love, from which proceeds selfishness, is a necessary and just impulse in that being whose highest destiny is to individualize and develop a material and perishable individuality.

CAUSE OF CRIME AND ITS REMEDY.

THE demands of justice and right are imperative, and must be obeyed, or they will curse men as members of society. Men can not fulfill their duty to themselves and others—they can not properly fulfill their destiny—without implicitly obeying the requirements of justice. Men can disobey the requirements of the laws of their physical well-being with more impunity and less disastrous results to themselves, than they can disregard the laws of their social and moral well-being. To habitually disregard the laws of their physical natures tends to beget disease, pain and physical death. To disregard the laws of their social, moral and spiritual natures, tends to beget moral, social and spiritual disease, wretchedness and death.

Under the divine government, every principle or law which prevails is omnipotent in its power, and imperative in its demands; and so far as it is able to bless when obeyed, is it potent to curse when disobeyed; and as certainly as it will bless obedience will it curse disobedience. The law of justice has reference to man in his social relations, and has reference to his conduct toward his fellow-man. That law demands that every individual, in his humanity and the rights incident to that humanity, shall be considered equal; that in all our intercourse with our brethren we shall be as careful not to infringe upon their rights, as we would be that they should not infringe upon ours; that we should accord to them whatever rights we claim for ourselves; that we should yield to them whatever we demand for ourselves. Justice demands that we should be as careful not to overreach them as we would be that they should not overreach us.

As remarked in a previous article, crime consists in impunity and injustice, and criminality consists in a disregard of the

claims of purity and justice; consequently all acts of injustice are in their nature criminal, and all intentions or desires to be unjust involve a criminal state or condition of the mind. I have already demonstrated that the principles upon which men transacted their ordinary business were purposely and designedly unjust, and consequently criminal; that is, men in their social and business relations aimed at being unjust, the end they labored to accomplish was unjust, and consequently the means they adopted for the accomplishment of that end would be unjust. Such being the case, men in society, that is, in their social relations, are habitually and constantly violating the demands of justice, and thereby placing themselves in antagonistic relations to the divine government. This state of things can not fail to develop crime in society. As surely as perfect obedience to the requirements of the divine government would develop virtue and happiness, so surely will disobedience to those requirements develop crime and wretchedness.

And the efforts made at partial reforms in society often exhibit greater expenditure of benevolence than of wisdom. No partial reform can succeed, because the cause of the evil remains untouched. When the physical system becomes so thoroughly diseased as to break out in cutaneous eruptions, ulcers, sores, etc., the remedy must be calculated to reach the cause of the disease. These external symptoms are frequently only the flag of distress which nature hangs out, indicating the critical state of the system. This flag of distress is designed to call the attention to the sad work going on within. Now it would be exceedingly unwise to attempt to banish the symptoms in any other way than by removing the disease. When the cause which hung out the flag is removed, the flag will be taken in, and that will be soon enough; till then it ought to hang out. Physicians have learned by experience the danger of driving back certain eruptions; they have found it wiser to aid nature in sending them out. So it is with partial reforms. The evils sought to be removed are frequently symptomatic of a deep and deadly disease which is lurking within; and although they may for a time seem to affect favorably the symptoms, yet it is often found that they have

been administering only to the symptoms, while the disease has been untouched, if not aggravated.

So also is it with all efforts to prevent crime by severe criminal codes. It matters not how severe your code may be, you will have occasion to put it in practice. If you punish petit larceny with death, men will steal. You may fine, imprison and gibbet; that will not prevent crime. Men will steal in spite of your jails; men will counterfeit in spite of your penitentiaries, and they will murder in defiance of your gibbets. These appliances may sometimes mitigate the symptoms, but they will not cure the disease. It lies deeper, and neither the hope of heaven nor the fear of hell can remove it. Your remedy must be more potent than all these things combined, or the evil will continue forever. The simple reason is, the frame-work of society is in antagonism with the demands of justice and right, and so long as that antagonism continues, omnipotence will work out these results. If fine and imprisonment could prevent stealing, why have they not done it? If penitentiaries could put a stop to forgery, counterfeiting, burglary, etc., why do these crimes continue? If gibbets can prevent murder, why are our newspapers constantly teeming with accounts of the commission of these crimes? Our criminal codes, and all the paraphernalia of criminal justice, have been in operation for more than five hundred years, and yet crimes are multiplying. The truth is, the cause of these evils lies below and beyond the reach of all these remedies. They are mere palliatives, and have no tendency even to remove the evil.

Until the rights of man shall be understood and be regarded as sacred and inalienable; until the principles of justice shall be observed, and her demands strictly complied with in all the intercourse and relations of life; until the whole end and aim of social organizations or human governments shall be to secure to the individual exact justice; until the principles upon which commercial and business transactions are conducted shall harmonize with justice, or until omnipotence is dethroned, crimes will prevail in society, and your criminal courts, jails, penitentiaries and gibbets are very nearly useless expenditures of money.

It can not be denied that they are incompetent to the end

sought to be accomplished; that crime ever has and ever will prevail in spite of them. We may multiply our jails, penitentiaries and gibbets indefinitely, and we may imprison and hang for every infraction of the criminal laws, and men will be criminal in spite of all such administration. They are not enlightened as to the real nature of right and justice; they respect not their demands; they are educated and disciplined to disregard them. You might as well educate and practice society in the use of intoxicating drinks as a common beverage, and punish excess or drunkenness with death, and thus think to escape drunkenness, as to practice society in the principles of crime, and then think to escape the commission thereof by punishing those who commit them.

As we say of the manufacturer, vender and respectable drinker, that they are the real supporters of intemperance, and as such are responsible for all the evils which flow from it, so of governments and society; they are responsible for all the crimes committed by individuals, and are individually and collectively as guilty as the criminal himself, and on the score of merit deserve all that the criminal deserves; and there is no way of avoiding this responsibility until they shall abandon the principles heretofore adopted and practiced, and shall adopt the principles of equity and exact justice in all their governmental and business relations and transactions.

We have already considered, to a certain extent, the proper sphere of governmental action, and will not pursue that branch of the investigation any further at this time. The subject now to be investigated is, what principles shall men adopt in their intercourse with each other. In the first place, there should be some means by which the equitable price of all articles constituting wealth can be determined; and as that which costs nothing should not be subject to price, equity demands that the price should be estimated by the cost of production; and as the cost of production consists in the labor it takes to produce the article, the price should depend on the amount of productive labor invested in the article. Labor, then, being the source of wealth proper, should be the measure of price; and as an article can not command a greater price than the cost of production, without

inducing a necessity that some other article should bring less than the cost of production, therefore equity demands that cost should be the limit of price. No other rule can be adopted and justice be done. If I am to receive one-half more for my labor than it actually produces, some other person or persons must receive proportionably less for their labor, and that is the kind of injustice which now prevails, and is such a fruitful source of wretchedness and crime.

Equity, then, demands that the price of an article should be graduated by the labor it takes to produce it, and that cost should be the limit of price. Let that rule be adopted and practiced upon, and justice would begin to be done. Labor would then be emancipated from capital, and labor would receive a just and full compensation. Let everything be estimated according to the amount of productive labor it contains, and there would be no opportunity for speculation. No man could possess himself of the labor or earnings of another without rendering an equivalent in labor or its product. He would not be able to buy at a low and sell at a high price, for the cost of the article would be known as measured by its true standard, labor.

Under such a system we should want no representation of value, for the simple reason that value can not be represented. I have already demonstrated that value is not an intrinsic, but only an accidental quality of property, depending entirely upon circumstances, and is usually the product of a man's necessity and ability; and inasmuch as there can be no standard of necessity and ability, there can be no standard value; and consequently we can have no measure, and therefore need no representation of value. In truth we can have no representation of value, for there is no real existence of the kind to represent.

Under the present system of commercial dealing based upon fraud and injustice, money seems to be not only useful to the swindler (legal), but absolutely indispensable. The principle of fixing price according to value, and value depending upon circumstances of necessity and ability, it seems necessary to have something to represent value, inasmuch as value will not represent itself. Value being capable of expansion to-day and contraction to-morrow, according to circumstances, must be consid-

ered in reference to some fictitious standard, and that standard must possess what appears to be a fixed unit of measure, else men could not express themselves in relation to it.

But as value ought not to be taken into consideration in fixing the price, we need no representation of it. As price ought to depend on the cost of production, and that cost ought to be estimated by the productive labor invested in the article, there should be some means by which to estimate or measure labor; that is, there should be some standard with which to compare labor. In measuring labor we must take into account the expenditure of strength, of comfort and time. Some kinds of labor are more laborious, some more disagreeable and difficult or dangerous to be performed, than others. All these things should be taken into the account in fixing a standard of measure for labor. Whatever is produced by labor is capable of being very accurately measured in this way, so that justice can be done in making exchanges, by rendering to the laborer an equivalent in labor.

Let everything be estimated according to the amount of labor it contains, and let nothing be estimated which does not contain labor, and then what there is of wealth would be found in the hands of the laborers. There would be an end of speculation in land, money or property; no man could possess himself of the products of labor without rendering an equivalent in labor or its product, and the equivalent he could not possess without laboring for it. This method would dispense with the use of money capital, and consequently would dispense with interest. The trader in any article would be limited in his price to the amount of labor he bestows in purchasing and bringing to market the articles he had for sale, which labor would be estimated by the amount of time consumed, the expenditure of strength, and the disagreeableness of the work.

Under this system, so long as labor is properly estimated, injustice can not well be done. The hardest and most disagreeable kinds of labor would be best paid, and justice requires that they should be. There would be no distinction made in reference to the persons performing the labor, old or young, male or female, and there should not be. Again, under this system la-

bor would be better rewarded. As those only who performed labor would have the means of obtaining it, all would be compelled to perform their part to maintain a respectable position in society, and consequently the laborer would not be compelled to support a host of idle traders, speculators and vagabonds.

The productiveness of labor has never yet been fully understood. The laborer does not probably receive one-eighth part of the product of his labor. Under existing arrangements it is not possible that he should. When we compare the number of the producers with the number of the consumers, the proportion of producers is very small. Take the community together, and probably not more than one-fifth are producers; perhaps not that proportion. Yet these consumers are all supported by the labor of the producers, and for which no equivalent is paid. All the immense fortunes built up by the trading, speculating, and gambling portion of community, all their extravagant expenditures and waste, are drawn from the earnings of the laboring class. All the support of the Church, with its costly edifices and furniture, with its priesthood, and all the paraphernalia of maintaining and carrying forward their schemes of proselytizing, etc., are drawn from the unpaid toil of the laborer. The support of the State in maintaining a national, state, county, and township or city government, is also drawn from the same source. Now, when we consider that these burdens of supporting the world in all its idleness, extravagance and folly, are thrown upon the shoulders of the producing class, and that they form but a small proportion of the mass, we are forced to the conclusion that labor is but poorly paid. We must conclude that the laborer does not get more than one-eighth paid for his labor; that is, would all do their part in sustaining the burdens of life, the laborer would not be obliged to labor more than one-eighth as many hours to sustain himself as he is now compelled to do.

Under our present system, the laborer is compelled to labor eight hours to get one for himself. He could not be thus enslaved if labor was the standard of price. His labor would then demand an equivalent, and that equivalent would contain the same labor, and he who was the most industrious and the most economical, would possess most of the products, and consequently

would possess most of wealth. The laborer is plundered by the practice of determining price according to what is called value, and that value represented by what is called money—two most potent means of injustice and plunder.

No proposition can be plainer than that the producers of what is termed wealth should be the possessors of it. The first class to be supplied with the necessaries and comforts of life should be those whose labor has produced them. And yet nothing can be plainer to every observer than that this is the last class supplied. While those who have never earned a farthing in their lives are wallowing in wealth and luxury, those upon whose labor they live are denied even the cheapest comforts of life; and yet the transfer of their hard earnings into the pockets of their wealthy masters seems to be fair, and legal and honest, and the poor laborer does not see exactly how it is done. He works hard; that he knows and feels. His employer is getting rich; that is equally plain. He can barely keep body and soul together. He can see that his employer is getting rich out of his hard earnings, and hence can infer that he is performing more labor than he is getting pay for, and that excess of labor is going to enrich his employer, who perhaps is performing no labor. But then he is taught to think that it is all right and just, because his employer furnishes capital, money, and thus gives him employment.

But let the laborer pause and reflect a moment. What is capital worth without labor? What can capital produce without labor? Nothing—absolutely nothing. The capitalist produces nothing with all his capital. It is the labor which capital commands that is productive. Capital is but a means of commanding or taxing labor; in other words, it is a means of enslaving labor. Capital now takes the place of brute force. In former times the tyrant would conquer and enslave a people, and by force compel her sons and daughters to work his mines, dig down his mountains, build his roads, erect his palaces, monuments, etc., yielding to the enslaved laborer so much of the means of supporting as was necessary to keep him in working condition. The histories of the Egyptians, the Grecians, the Romans and Russians, furnish many striking examples of the kind. But capital has now taken the place of brute force; and

although the laborer is now nominally a free man, he is none the less a slave to capital, and he is none the less plundered by it. The men who build our public buildings, our state houses, court houses, churches, our private mansions, our canals, railroads and other works of improvement, are as much enslaved and plundered by capital as were those who built the pyramids in Egypt or the roads in Italy enslaved and plundered by force, and the hardship and injustice of the latter was no greater than is the hardship and injustice of the former.

And furthermore, there was this advantage to the laborer under the system of enslaving and plundering by force instead of by fraud. The despot had an interest in keeping the enslaved in good working order, while capital does not look after any such advantage. Capital in itself is no more productive than brute force; it no more lessens the burden of the laborer. The tyrant who with his implements of force compels the laborer to his toil, and pockets all his earnings save what is absolutely necessary for his subsistence, produces as much as the capitalist, and no more wrongs or defrauds labor.

The end accomplished by them is the same. The tyrant seeks to obtain labor without rendering an equivalent for it, and to profit by that excess of labor. The capitalist seeks the same. He seeks to take advantage of the circumstances of the laborer to compel his labor at such a price that he can add to his wealth by his unpaid toil. Capital produces nothing, and therefore it should be paid nothing, any more than the tyrant should be paid for compelling labor by force.

But let us examine how it is that capital, money, value, etc., conspire to rob labor. In the first place, it establishes the principle that value is to be taken into the account in fixing the price of an article; and inasmuch as value depends upon demand and supply, or upon necessity and ability, and as they are constantly changing, it thus unfixes the price of labor in its product, and brings it directly under the control of capital. Now, as capital is measured by dollars and cents, and they are made to represent value, the capitalist by his money can enter the market, and command labor to be measured by his money-standard; and although the products of labor are constantly changing under his

standard of value, yet he does not allow labor to advance as its products do.

The capitalist being possessed of money, or credit based upon it, can purchase labor at the lowest price, and yet demand for its products the highest price; hence capital either employs the produce or purchases of the producer at the lowest price, and sells to the consumer at the highest price; and so far as the laborer is the consumer, he pays the highest price for what he consumes. For example: The laborer works for his employer at the lowest price in manufacturing articles for him. This he must do, or he could not get employment; yet if he wishes to purchase articles for his own or family's use, such as tea, coffee, sugar, butter, flour, meat, clothing, etc., he pays the highest price, as he gets these articles at the retail price, and the retail price includes the price paid the laborer in producing them, the profit paid to capital in their production, the profit of the importer and jobber, the profit of the wholesale dealer and of the retailer. Aside from paying all these profits, out of which fortunes are to be made by these several classes, there are also indirect tariffs on the article. Thus, on the production of the article there is interest and insurance on capital. On the importation of the article, if it be an imported one, there is interest and insurance on the capital invested in the purchase, interest and insurance on the transportation in the shape of extra freightage, interest and insurance on the capital of the jobber, and interest, insurance and rent on the capital and risk and storage of the retailer. Thus, in tracing up these things it will readily be perceived that there is an almost infinite variety of tariffs or taxes on the consumption of the producer, which he is obliged to pay out of his labor at the minimum price.

Again, to bring the matter directly home to the understanding of all, let us take a given case. Here are one class of laborers who support themselves with the needle. Now, be it remembered that what they get they receive as the price of their labor at the lowest estimate. Mind, I do not say what they produce, but what they get. This may be two or three shillings per day. Now this money or price is to be expended in purchasing the necessaries of life. These they are compelled to pay the highest

price for. If it be an article manufactured by a fellow-laborer in another department of industry, it does not come at the price that laborer received for the production of it, but it comes increased by interest, taxes, insurance, and profit on capital invested; it comes charged with interests and rents and profits charged by the retailer, because the poor laborer has not the means to purchase by the quantity, but must purchase at retail day by day—must always buy at the top of the price; and labor, being all he has for sale, must always be at the bottom of the price.

Thus it will be perceived that the laborer is plundered in two ways—first, by being defrauded of the just earnings or productiveness of his labor, and second, by being compelled to pay tribute to capital in innumerable ways on everything he buys. Thus capital is constantly standing between labor and its production. The laborer is converted into a mere machine, and it takes about so much oiling to keep it in motion. Capital feeds on the articles to be manufactured, and capital spreads her lap to catch them after they are thus manufactured and thus labor is made the slave of capital, and is degraded by its slavery. All this comes by estimating price according to value, and making money a representative of value. Let value cease to have a nominal existence so far as price is concerned, and then there will be no need of its representative, money, or money capital. Let labor determine the cost of an article, and let that cost be the limit of price, and there will be an end of this plundering. Labor will then be justly rewarded with the products of its own industry, and if men would have wealth, they would be compelled to produce it by labor.

Under that arrangement, the soil would bear no price, ground rent would cease, and land monopoly, that most fruitful source of oppression and robbery, would be no more. Capital, which now rules in Church and State with a despotic sway never exercised by despot in the palmiest days of despotism, would then lose its power, and the laborer would be emancipated, and something like equality would begin to be manifested.

But is it asked, How is this reform to be brought about? How is labor to be emancipated? You shall answer the question

yourselves. Were you slaves under the iron rule of a tyrant, how would you seek to emancipate yourselves? By submitting to his unjust and tyrannical demands? By trying to content yourselves with your lot, and thanking God it was as well with you as it was? By trying to persuade your fellow slaves that it was impossible to strike successfully for freedom, and therefore it was best to be contented, and lick the hand that crushed you? Or would you obey the impulses of the manhood within you, and stand erect and claim the rights of manhood? Would you not make an effort to arouse all who like you were enslaved, and to make them sensible of the foul wrong and injustice which was done to you? In view of your rights as a man, and your wrongs as a slave, would you not cry, "Give me liberty, or give me death!"

If you were the slaves of force, you would know what steps to take to secure your emancipation. You would resist the oppressor to the last extremity, and whether successful in your effort, or overpowered and slain, you would not be a slave. You would be free. There is no sacrifice you would not make to secure your freedom. If you were compelled for a while to wander in the mountains and morasses, houseless and foodless, you would endure it all patiently and bravely in prospect of being self-emancipated and free. The tyrant would arm another portion of his slaves, and under promises of making them free would send them against you. A little effort and prudent management would secure their efforts in your favor, and thus turn the arms of the tyrant against himself. The tyrant himself could not conquer you without employing slaves to fight you.

So it is with capital—with the money power. Pursue the same course to emancipate yourselves from the slavery of fraud, you would to emancipate yourselves from the slavery of force. Remember capital is worthless and powerless without labor. It can not produce even a pin or a pepper-corn. Without labor it must go naked and hungry and cold; without labor it could not clothe itself in purple and fine linen, and fare sumptuously every day; without labor its gold would be as worthless as the bag of pearls found by the famishing traveler in the desert. Labor is not dependent upon capital for its food and clothing and shelter.

it is dependent upon itself and itself alone, and it is nothing but slavish ignorance and blind servility that keeps the laborer in bondage.

What power on earth can resist the demands of labor? Capital is snugly ensconced in its golden citadel, pampered and nursed, and fed and worshiped, but she is entirely at the mercy of labor. All her gold would be dross if labor should refuse to take it, and render therefor its products; and although capital is thus snugly ensconced, the laborer holds her entirely within his power. Labor can besiege capital at any moment and cut off all supplies, and thus compel her to surrender at discretion. Let labor make a declaration of independence and rally in support of it, and capital must yield.

If capital wants food, say not to her, Buy it, but produce it; if she wants clothing say to her, Make it; if she wants shelter, say to the lordling, Put your own soft hand to the work, I'll be your slave no longer. Let labor reject the base bribes of capital—money—which is truly the root of all the evil. It is the wand of conjuration by which the products of labor are silently but surely transferred from the laborer into the pockets of capital. It is unnecessary and useless, and worse than a useless thing; it is the great instrument of fraud and plunder, and without it capital would be harmless.

Come home to this city, and see what would be the result if labor should put forth its declaration of independence of capital; if the poor needle-woman should put up her needles, and the wood-sawyer should hang up his saw, and the truckman should lay aside his dray, and the journeyman mechanic should refuse to let the sound of his hammer and plane and saw etc., be heard in the workshop of capital. Let there be at once a total divorce of labor and capital. Who would then be your beggars? Your laborer would then be the man of capital. In the strong, sinewy arm and callous hand, and body inured to toil, would spring up a mine of inestimable wealth. If the laborer wanted food he could raise it; if he wanted clothing, he could manufacture it; if he wanted a shelter, he could make it; while poor, weak, sickly, soft-handed capital would be palsied and dead. Luxury and sumptuous living would not follow in the wake of the clink of the hitherto almighty dollar. But if capital wished a gar-

ment, it would take labor to make or buy it; if capital wished to idle away its time in slothful non-productiveness, it would be obliged to fast as well as pray. Capital would then be seen at the buck-saw, using the mallet and chisel, pushing the plane, driving the nail, riding on the dray, stitching the garment, etc. Labor would then be respected and become respectable. If capital wished a railroad, it would build it with its own hands, and not with its worthless and corrupting money; if capital wished a canal, she would be obliged to put her soft, delicate hand to the spade.

Under the arrangements of the divine government, the "higher law," labor is independent of capital, and stands in no need of aid or assistance from her, and labor will never be blessed until it assumes the position God designed it to occupy. Justice imperatively demands that she take her position at once, and banish money from her consideration. Labor must forever be a slave while it is in the employ of capital, and the laborer must occupy the position of a serf, and while occupying that position can not fulfill the duty and destiny of a freeman. Labor has the power to assume her position, and render capital subservient to herself; she has within herself the means of commanding that respect and profit which is now awarded to capital.

CONCERNING COLORS BY WHICH SPIRITUAL THINGS ARE
SIGNIFIED.

"THAT spiritual things are represented by colors is known," says Swedenborg, "from [the signification of] the rainbow, and from other colors, and also from experiments; that it may be known [I will here state] only in reference to black and white; that black is of such a nature as to absorb all rays, and to scatter them around in a confused manner, without any order—hence is blackness; it is the same with evil, which is represented thereby, since it absorbs all the rays of intellectual light, and scatters them in so confused a manner, that at length nothing of light or of whiteness appears. White, on the contrary, does not receive the rays of light, but reflects them; in like manner, those who justify themselves, and who place justice or righteousness in their works, reflect the rays of intellectual or of interior light, nor do they admit any; it is similar in respect to other colors."—*Spiritual Diary*, 1393.

A DREAM OF FLOWERS.

BY H. CLAY PREUSS.

We extract the following from the *Spiritual Telegraph*, and endorse the remarks of the Editor of that paper:

"After a long silence which we—and, we venture to add, our readers—have had occasion to regret, we are once more greeted by our dear friend, Henry Clay Preuss, to whom we are indebted for the subjoined poem.

"‘A Dream of Flowers’ is a characteristic offering which beautifully illustrates the delicacy of the author’s perceptions and fancies, and the exquisite purity of his sentiments. His muse—a real being—comes to us with the manuscript, wearing an expression of unutterable tenderness. We discern the form through the soft twilight shadows that vail his own spiritual being, and we feel penetrated by a soothing yet thrilling influence, while we were reading the Poem. We are impressed that it was inspired by the Spirit of a fair inhabitant of the Inner World, whose life of fearful trial on earth was ‘a crown of thorns,’ long since, followed by palms of noble victory in Heaven. She is an incarnation of pure feeling, of delicate thought and sentiment, and of exquisite happiness; but when she comes within the sphere of mundane objects and relations, the shadows of her earth-life fall on the gentle Spirit, and leave their images on the forms of her inspiration. Hence this sad, sweet strain. Like the captive Hebrews, our poet-friend resigns himself to lonely musings ‘by the river,’ while he is held in bondage by the world’s great Babylon.

His harp is on the willows, and life's rude winds, as they sweep
the chords, people the very air with notes that fall in mournful
cadence on the spiritual ear, like the heart's broken music. ED."

One golden morn in summer-time
I wandered in a garden,
Whose flower-diamonds crown a lawn
That looks down on the Arden.

I wandered long through Gothic shades
And oriental bowers ;
Then fell asleep on a mossy bank
And dreamt a dream of flowers.

Beside me bloomed a violet—
My cheek was lying near it ;
And when I slept, methought its form
Was changed to a human Spirit.

Ah ! many a pang that flower had felt
Ere its virgin leaves unfurled ;
For the earth was cold and the days were dark,
When it lived in the Under-world.

But lo ! when the Angel, Spring came round,
From her wintry rest arisen—
She rolled the stone from its tomb away,
And the soul went out of prison.

Then the violet woke in the Upper-world,
And ope'd its baby-eyes ;
Dear God ! what a flood of splendor burst
From earth and the starry skies

Through the freezing cold, and foul, dark earth,
This brave, pure flower had striven ;
And now the winds came from the South
And whispered dreams of heaven !

The Day-god stooped from his peerless throne
And smothered her cheek with kisses ;
She thrilled and glowed, grew faint with joy,
Till tranced in a world of blisses !

Each morn she fed on the purest dews
From the mother breast of Night ;
And she wove her a robe of dazzling sheen
From rays of the soft moon-light.

The South wind brought her greetings kind
 From far-off Tropic bowera;
 For odors are, like spoken words,
 The native speech of flowera.

Now the Violet had no selfish heart,
 Though from the earth arisen;
 She yearned to speak with her sister dear,
 Who lingered still in prison.

Then the soul of the flower went down
 To its old home under the earth,
 And spoke to her embryo-sister there
 Of the joys of the "second birth."

She told of the world in the upper-air,
 With its myriad forms of light—
 Of the soft South breeze and the nectar dews,
 And the spangled realms of Night!

But ah! these words fell cold and dead
 On her mortal sister's ear,
 Who had no thought, in her prison-gloom,
 Beyond her own dark sphere.

She doubted much her sister's voice,
 And drowned its sweet revealing;
 For the earth around was cold and dark,
 And crushed each holier feeling.

Then the angel-flower grew sad at heart,
 As one by hope forsaken;
 But again she smiled, and joyous said,
 Thank God! she'll soon awaken!

* * * * *

My dream went out—the flower was there—
 The sun still brightly beaming;
 But something said I had dreamt a dream
 That was not all a dreaming:

That the human soul was like that flower,
 The Under-world may harden;
 But touched by Death, 'twill blossom out
 In God's Eternal Garden!

* * * * *

O, golden days of summers dead!
 My fresh young hopes awaking;
 I can not feel your olden charm—
 My poor, sad heart is breaking!

And yet, thank God! a higher light
 Unto my soul is given,
 Which sheds upon my prison-gloom
 A glory as of heaven!

They come to me in solemn dreams,
 The souls of those arisen;
 They say my time will soon be out,
 And I shall leave my prison.

The earth is cold, the night is dark,
 There is no sign of day;
 I'm waiting for the Angel, Death,
 To roll the stone away!

WASHINGTON, D. C., October, 1856.

WHAT SHALL I DO?

"Content is a kingdom." And "Do with thy might whatsoever thy hand findeth to do." There is always something to be done. Nobody was ever idle who instantly set about doing the *nearest* thing. The world is full of "something to do." Do the nearest, and the next, and the next. Don't wait for the plan. Your plan will breed in good season out of the multiplicity of your labors; it will never come to good out of their non-existence. You will find ere long that you are working the yoke of a better planner than yourself. God is sure to find work for busy hands, as Satan is to find mischief for idle ones. Take hold anywhere. Go out and saw that cord of four-feet wood; clear the weeds out of that beet-bed. Set your books in a straight row; put your clothes in order in your trunk. You will think of something else before you have done that; in a world so full of things as this, there is nothing which is not the first thing of an infinite series.—*Life Illustrated.*

AN ANALYSIS OF MAN.

THE object of this article is to analyze man for the purpose of studying his nature and ascertaining the source of all his impulses to action; for that which thinks, wills and acts, constitutes the man. In a former article we had occasion to trace the path of development through the mineral, vegetable and animal kingdom until we came to man. As we entered upon each of these kingdoms, we found the manifestation of new principles which had not appeared before, at the same time they were accompanied by all the preceding manifestations. Thus, when we entered the animal kingdom we found the development of the nervous medium, embracing sensation and motion, accompanied by vitality, magnetism, electricity and matter. In treating upon man as a thinking and acting being, we care to notice only those things which make him such.

As man differs from all preceding developments, in the nature and power of his mind, and those desires and aspirations which grow out of that difference, we will again notice the offices of sensation and instinct which make up the mind of the animal, and that of the individualized immortal spirit which makes up the mind of man. The office of sensation is to reveal only the external and perishable forms of existence, or the accidentals of real existence. Instinct is designed to supply the place of reason, and is found where, from want of observation and the power of comparison, reason can not exist; and yet the action to be performed by its impulse is essential to the existence of the being. Sensation and instinct compose the mind of the animal, and it can never rise above their revealments; it can comprehend no class of truths they can not fully reveal; it can never examine the interior of things. Depending upon sensation for its ex-

istence, the animal mind must begin where sensation begins, and end where it ends. The desires and aspirations of the animal are confined to the sphere of sensible effects. In that sphere all its wishes can fully be gratified. It can perceive nothing beyond; it can anticipate nothing beyond; and hence it aspires to nothing beyond. With its physical wants supplied and its animal desires gratified, the brute is contented and at ease.

Not so with man. While he possesses a nature purely animal in its character, which can be satisfied with physical objects, he possesses also another nature, which demands something beyond. The physical and external will not gratify it. Like the animal, he can perceive the external forms of existence, but they are only suggestive of an internal cause, and his higher nature is constantly attracted toward, or drawn out after that cause, and it can not be satisfied until it can find it out. An eternal Why, and How and What is disturbing his rest, and he must attend to their demands. This higher nature is constantly looking beyond this exterior world; its aspirations and desires center in the sphere of causation and spirit, and can only be gratified by that which belongs to that sphere; hence in this lower sphere of existence the mind will ever be active, restless and unquiet. There will always be an aching void the world can not fill.

But as man in this sphere is a compound being, composed of the animal, which belongs to this sphere alone, and the spiritual, which belongs to the next sphere, he will exhibit the two characters. He will exhibit the animal intensified and the spiritual modified, and by carefully attending to the phenomena of his compound character, we shall be able to determine the motives and impulses which prompt his actions, and ascertain how far they are animal, how far they are spiritual, and how far they are mixed. By carefully investigating the character of those animals which most nearly approach the development of immortal spirit, we shall be able to determine the scope of animal impulse, and the capacity of animal intellect.

It may be remarked in the outset, that the *end* and aim of all animal appetites, interests, passions and affections, look to the development of their animal bodies, the propagation of their species, and the defense of themselves and those dependent upon

them, from that which threatens injury or destruction. These are all the ends there are to be provided for in the animal economy, and consequently it would have been out of place to have endowed them with other aspirations and desires. The means of gratifying all these appetites, interests, passions, etc., are supplied in this sphere of material existence, and consequently they can be fully gratified here, and the full destiny of the animal be accomplished. The appetites are but the voice of nature calling for material to build up and keep in repair the animal system, and are indicative of such a demand. The passions are those impulses which stimulate the animal to defend itself against danger, or that which threatens to invade its chartered existence, as well as that impulse which leads it to seek to continue its existence in its offspring. Its affections are those impulses which go out of itself and lead it to seek the well-being of another during the period of the helpless dependence of that other being, and no further.

In the animal, the proper office of these appetites, instincts, passions, etc., can be observed by a close attention to the habits of the animal. Possessing no higher nature to goad them into action, they are not intensified in the mere animal, but are seen performing their legitimate and proper functions. Hence in the fields of nature we can learn true wisdom from the volume written by the finger of God in these rudimental developments of man. The animal eats only to supply the demands of a healthy appetite, and not for the purpose of deriving pleasure from eating; and eats those things which are best suited to supply that demand. Hence their appetites never become depraved, and they never destroy themselves by gluttony. They drink to quench a healthy thirst, and only for that purpose. Hence they seek not to tickle the palate with mixed or unnatural drinks, and you have no dissipated or drunken animals. They gratify their sexual desires for the purpose of propagating their species, and not for supplying themselves with an unnatural source of gratification and enjoyment; hence they run not into excess of lust, and thereby enervate, disease and destroy themselves; hence you find no libertines or debauchees among mere animals. In supplying their wants, they seek to appropriate no more than

their wants demand. They are no monopolists. The swine will share his slough with his brother swine, and the horse and ox and sheep, their pasture and their shade.

Their passions are called into exercise only when nature demands their exercise. If in danger, they will flee, if that be practicable; if not, they will resist. They, however, consult their own feelings and convenience in such a matter. If they feel competent to resist, and resistance seems practical, they will do so until the danger is removed or they are overcome. But such resistance ends their desire of conquest. There are no Don Quixotes or Alexanders among mere animals; they are too true to nature and too sensible to exhibit such folly. Their affection for their young leads them to provide for them during the period of their helpless dependence, and to defend them during their tender imbecility. Beyond that they have no duties to perform toward them; and nature, true to that end in her impulses, gives them no further trouble or care about them. Here, then, let us study the true end and aim of all our animal appetites, instincts, passions and desires. Let us learn a lesson from this page of nature. "Go to the ant; consider her ways and be wise."

We find man as an animal possessing all these appetites, instincts, passions and affections intensified, in consequence of which he is constantly running into those excesses and vices from which the mere animal is free, and which are the source of all the physical, civil, social and moral evils which afflict the world. Were man an animal merely, he would be guilty of none of those excesses and vices. These excesses are the result of the aspirations and desires of his immortal nature misdirected. The spirit gives the impulse, the animal gives the direction; hence man's vices and crimes are the product of his compound nature. Were he a mere animal, there would be nothing to give the impulse; were he a pure spirit, there would be nothing to misdirect. In the animal, motives to action are exterior to the animal; in the spirit, impulses are interior to the spirit. In the animal, selfishness is the great and all-absorbing motive power. In the spirit, love or innate spiritual affinity impels to action, and these two are in a state of apparent antagonism. The tendency of selfishness is to seek our own gratification at the ex-

pense of the happiness and well-being of others, if need be, or at least regardless of the well-being of others; the tendency of love is to seek the well-being and happiness of others regardless of our own. Hence it is said, "The spirit warreth against the flesh, and the flesh lusteth against the spirit." It is only when the animal usurps the place of the spiritual, that this antagonism exists. In its own sphere, performing its own proper functions, it exists in harmony with the spirit, and when under its control will find its own well-being and happiness harmonizing with the well-being and happiness of others.

This selfishness of the animal nature is the foundation of all the passions and affections of the mere animal, and is absolutely essential to stimulate it to protect and defend its individual existence. It is an attribute of the animal, and is animal in all it provokes. Selfishness is the highest motive power the animal is capable of attaining to. Having no interior or spiritual nature, it can not act from spiritual impulses or affinities. The highest form of animal existence being subject to destruction, its highest motive power must be to preserve that form from destruction; hence its highest care must be to provide for and defend itself. To this end all animal activity tends, and in fulfilling this end it finds all its gratifications and happiness; for nature, in all her plans of operation, has ordained that gratification shall flow from the proper discharge of all our obligations either to ourselves or others.

But the spiritual nature of man, being immortal in its constitution and not subject to destruction, has no occasion to provide against any such result; therefore it has no demand for the attribute of selfishness, and therefore has it not. This spiritual nature, being once in existence, must forever continue to exist, and therefore its motives, desires and aspirations must have reference to something aside from perpetuating its existence. The end of its existence is to develop and expand to infinity in the elements of its being; therefore its motives, aspirations and desires must have reference to that end, and must be such as can only be gratified by such activity as tends to develop and expand those elements; and as love or interior delight is the impelling power of the spirit, its entire activity, to gratify its desires, must harmonize

with perfect love; and as wisdom or true knowledge is the state or condition to which the spirit tends, it must also harmonize with all truth. Hence the appetites, desires and aspirations of the soul will naturally demand for their gratification the constant exercise of all the active virtues, and perfect obedience to all the claims of truth and justice.

This fundamental position must be kept in sight. An appetite or desire is indicative of a demand. If it be a natural appetite or desire, it will arise from a natural demand; and when that demand is properly supplied, it will afford gratification. Hence, when there is a healthy appetite for food, it indicates a demand on the part of the physical system for material to nourish and develop it, and by properly supplying that demand with the appropriate food, gratification will be afforded, and the system will be nourished and developed. So also if there is a healthy thirst, that indicates, on the part of the system, a demand for appropriate fluids, and the proper supplying of that demand will afford gratification; and thus is it in reference to all the natural demands of the animal; they are all indicated by natural appetites and desires, and are all legitimate and proper; and when properly supplied produce gratification and animal enjoyment.

But as all animal appetites and desires are based upon the nature and necessities of the animal constitution, so are all spiritual appetites and desires based upon the nature and necessities of the spiritual constitution, and indicate a demand for that which is necessary to nourish, develop and expand the spiritual being; and as all animal appetites and desires have reference to the *end* of its animal existence, so also have all spiritual appetites, aspirations and desires reference to the *end* of our spiritual existence; and as animal gratification results from properly supplying such demands, so spiritual gratification or true happiness will result from properly supplying those spiritual demands.

In the animal, its highest gratification consists in supplying properly the natural demands of its physical nature, because that is the highest end of its existence; that is, the utmost limit of its desires and aspirations, and therefore it can attain to no higher happiness than their proper gratification affords. For

this reason, there is nothing to stimulate the mere animal to commit excess.

But man, being possessed of a higher nature and destiny, being stimulated by desires and aspirations commensurate with that nature and destiny, can never obtain true happiness short of a proper gratification of those desires and aspirations. He, although an animal, is a god in the immortality of his nature, and must be gratified as a god to be truly happy, and not as an animal. Hence, while the animal can reap its fill of happiness in supplying the demands of its physical nature, man remains discontented and miserable if only those demands are supplied; there is that within him which calls for higher gratification. It is the God within admonishing him of his true nature and destiny, and demanding him, as he would be happy, to be faithful and responsive to it; but man, ignorant of the nature of this demand, has sought to gratify it by administering to his animal passions, appetites and desires; has set about creating artificial appetites, and thus intensified them and diseased his animal nature; and hence have arisen all the civil, social and moral evils which curse society and man. Man, in thus intensifying his animal appetites, passions, etc., is at war with himself, his nature and destiny; by his own animal selfishness he becomes his own worst enemy, and it requires the interposition of heaven to keep him from destroying himself.

Such being the nature and constitution of man, he must never expect to satisfy the demands of his spiritual nature by any attempt at gratifying the animal, and consequently he must never expect happiness in any pursuit which does not look beyond that animal nature. His animal nature was not intended as a means of conferring happiness upon him, but only as an instrument of individualizing his spirit, and continuing that process of individualization in his offspring. It is one of the *means*, not the *end* of his existence; its business is subordinate to minister to the spirit, not to be ministered unto by the spirit. Man's happiness was designed to consist in pursuing legitimately and properly his highest destiny, and not in trifling with the means by which that destiny was to be pursued. If man could find full and complete satisfaction in the gratification of his animal na-

ture, it would be proof positive that he possessed no higher nature to be gratified. Hence the restlessness and dissatisfaction attending man in his worldly pursuits is the voice of God within, calling him away to a higher life.

Herein is the reason why man can not be satisfied by anything or everything which this world can bestow. Let these positions be understood. Man can only find true happiness in gratifying the demands of his higher nature, but the demands of his higher nature can not be gratified by anything which looks not beyond his physical or external being. Hence in all his pursuits after wealth, fame or power, man can not obtain happiness, and by these pursuits he only intensifies the desires of his lower nature beyond their capacity of gratification, and consequently entails on himself dissatisfaction and misery.

The truth of these positions has been verified by the experience of the universal past and present. The history of Alexander the Great is the history of every individual who has sought after happiness in the pursuit of fame or power. Feeling the impulses and desires of his immortal nature demanding action and gratification, he vainly imagined that gratification could be obtained in the conquest of the world. Stimulated to action by his immortal cravings, he drew his sword and rushed madly upon man. The wailings of widows and orphans awoke in his path. He carried desolation and ruin wherever he went; on he strode, crushing human hearts at every step, until the world was conquered, and lay in slavish subjection at his feet. Kings and princes were his subjects, and all nations were tributary to him. There he stood on the pinnacle of fame and power, a monument of solitude and grief. To what further attainment could he aspire? What wish could he indulge which he had not the abundant means to gratify? Appetite, passion and lust had the world at their command, and yet could not confer happiness. The reason is obvious; Alexander had attempted to satisfy the demands of his higher nature, by laboring to administer to the lower; and by so doing he had not only left his spiritual nature to famish, but had intensified his baser passions and appetites beyond their capacity of gratification, and thus rendered himself hopelessly wretched.

So also is it with those who make wealth the object of their attainment. The desire of gain is constantly stimulating them to incessant toil and privation. And yet success brings with it no enduring satisfaction. It serves only to intensify the desire beyond its capacity of being gratified. The case of the French miser is a fair illustration of the power of wealth to beget happiness. In Paris, there lived a man whose desires and aspirations centered in the acquisition of wealth. He arose early, sat up late, toiled hard, and eat the bread of carefulness, that he might lay up for himself earthly treasures, and he was abundantly successful in his efforts. His wealth rolled in upon him until it amounted to untold millions. But with the increase of his riches, his avaricious desires and anxious cares increased. The desire of getting and the fear of losing deprived him of appetite, and rest and sleep. In his fevered dreams he had visions and forebodings of bank failures, stock depreciations, conflagrations and shipwrecks. His wealth seemed always to be on the wing, and just ready to escape his grasp. He turned his property into gold, and resolved to keep it within his own custody and control. Then he thought of the ingenuity of thieves and the frailty of locks, and prudence seemed to demand his constant presence, to watch over and guard his golden heaps. There he heard the footsteps of the robber, the supposed whisper of the assassin, and the midnight work of the burglar, as they lurked around for his life and gold. Thus he continued to watch night and day, until tired and abused nature gave way, and left the old man a victim to gold and despair. He felt that his life of toil and privation had only seemed to heap upon him wretchedness and misery, and there was no prospect of relief. His desire for gain was still unabated, and yet every dollar it brought only added a new pang to his head and heart. He resolved to end the scene, and seek in death that which life had denied to him—rest and quiet. With this intention he hastened to the river, and as he stood upon its banks, taking his farewell view of earth, and about to pronounce his last malediction upon it, he thrust his hands into his pocket, where he found four guineas which had escaped the prison of their fellows. He took them in his hand, and for the first time in his life, he *felt* they were of no value to him—for

the first time in his life he *thought* they might be of some value to some poor suffering child of sorrow. With this feeling and this thought, he turned away to find some needy one upon whom he might bestow them. He had not gone far when he came to the door of a wretched hovel. He heard within the cry of poverty and distress; he entered. There lay on a pallet of straw, and covered with rags, a sick and widowed mother; scattered upon the floor sat four hungry little ones crying for bread, and the mother none to give, and no means for procuring any. There she lay in agony, such as none but mothers can feel for perishing babes—perishing for want of food, and none to give. She had just prayed, “Father, give us this day our daily bread,” when the old miser entered her door. He came to her bedside. Silently he placed the guineas in her hand. The mother looked upon the guineas, then upon the giver; then upon the guineas, and upon the giver again, as if to assure herself it was not a dream. Then she seized his hand, she pressed it to her lips. The warm tears bathed it and she blessed him, and she prayed God to bless him. She bade her little ones to come and bless him, and they came, and blessings, thanks and prayers were showered thick upon him. The old miser’s heart gave way—the flesh was pierced. A thrill of joy, of satisfaction, of exquisite delight shot through his soul, and sent the blood tingling to the tips of his fingers and toes. A spirit tongue seemed to whisper in his ears, “WELL DONE.” What! what! exclaimed the old man, is happiness so cheap? Then will I be happy. He turned away, not to drown himself, but to fill his pockets with guineas, and search out the objects of charity, that he might relieve them. Thus he spent the remainder of his life, and at last died in a good old age, testifying to all around that the way to be happy was to be useful and good.

In the foregoing incident is to be found a lesson taught by God himself. When the shipwrecked mariner is thrown upon some barren rock, famishing from thirst with the ocean around him, why does he not drink? Because he knows that every drop of that brine will only serve to intensify that thirst, and could he drink the ocean dry, he would only increase, not satisfy, its rage; whereas, one simple quaff of the appropriate drink would

afford him the most exquisite satisfaction and delight. So was it with the old miser. He had been striving to satisfy the demands of his higher nature with food unsuited for it; he had been drinking brine to assuage his thirst, but the moment he even accidentally complied with the demands of his higher nature, the dove returned with the olive leaf in her mouth; the ark rested on the top of the mountain, and despair subsided from the face of his soul.

This lesson is taught by the universal experience of man. Happiness is the great boon for which all are seeking, and that happiness must be obtained in gratification, and that gratification must be such as flows from complying with the demands of our higher nature. Our higher nature demands love—universal, unselfish love, and wisdom, true knowledge, that it may develop and expand in the elements of its being. Deprive it of such food, and it will famish; and its hungerings and thirstings will fill the soul with disquiet and misery.

When will man learn wisdom from the teachings of experience? When will he listen to, and understand, the admonitions of the God within, which tells him that happiness can not be found in the pursuit of wealth or fame or power, as an end of human attainment? When will he understand the wisdom and benevolence of that plan which is constantly striving to win him from these low and groveling pursuits which tend to unduly develop his animal nature, and thereby crush and destroy his spiritual; and to attract him in the ways of happiness and eternal life? When will he listen to that voice which is ever ready to bless him with the richest blessings of peace and joy and happiness, whenever he is striving, from pure, unselfish motives, to promote the well-being, peace and happiness of others? The widow's mite, the cup of cold water, a kind and gentle word, or even look, are never without their reward. They are sure to bestow a quiet peace and happiness the wealth of all the world can not purchase.

The highest *end* of man's existence being to ultimate an individualized immortal spirit, with a capacity of infinite expansion and development in love and knowledge, attended with perfect and complete happiness in that expansion, infinite or perfect

wisdom could not have ordained it otherwise consistent with that *end*, than that happiness should only be found in such pursuits as tended thus to develop and expand the soul in harmony with the development and expansion of every other soul in the universe. And it stands forth an eternal memorial of the perfect wisdom and goodness of our Creator, that in his arrangements nothing will confer true and perfect happiness upon man, which does not tend to promote the well-being and happiness of every created intelligence; and this innate desire for happiness which pervades every breast is the gravitating principle of the spirit, drawing it toward, and binding it to, the heart of God, and thus love becomes to the spirit-world what the law of universal gravitation is to the material universe.

The physical or animal nature of man, being designed only as an instrument for thus individualizing and ultimating this spirit in its natural and legitimate functions, harmonizes with the *end* it was designed to fulfill. Left to itself, it makes no demand which ought not to be complied with. Its natural appetites, instincts and desires, are as holy and sacred as are the appetites, instincts and desires of the spirit; and if man would be content to let them perform their legitimate functions, and not strain them beyond their capacity and design, he would be blessed in their use. The Creator of all things has affixed to the proper supply of their demands a gratification sufficient to compensate for the labor of supplying them, and no more. That amount of happiness is all he intended they should have power to confer, and he fixed that as the limit of their capacity. When strained beyond that point, they become over-taxed and intensified, and become a source of irritation and suffering, of disease and physical death; and this very death, when thus induced, is a benevolent provision of our wise Creator. When the compound being man, thus seeks to thwart his own destiny, by making his physical body a means of crushing his immortal spirit, and inflicting upon it wounds from which it can never recover, it is a wise and benevolent provision that in consequence of such acts, the spirit can be divorced from such a body.

Every act in man's life which harmonizes with the end for which he exists, will confer upon him happiness in proportion as

it is calculated to promote that end; and it will fail to confer happiness if it is indifferent to that end, and it will tend to make him miserable if it conflicts with that end. Hence when man, in his ignorance or madness, attempts to obtain happiness by pampering his appetites, passions and lusts, he makes himself miserable through disease, irritation and insatiable desire; he loses his self-respect; when his soul can find him alone, she re-proves him, and points the finger of scorn at him, and causes him to despise himself. His inner sanctuary is polluted, and he finds no place of retreat from his vices, where he can enjoy that sweet communion of spirit so essential to true happiness. This is a part of that penalty which nature inflicts upon man for attempting to disturb her economy and make that an *end* which was only designed as a *means* of existence. Did she not inflict that penalty, man would fail of his higher destiny. He would control himself with that which must perish with the using; therefore she chastises him for his folly, and points him to the eternal destiny which awaits him.

As the physical body is an instrument for individualizing the spirit, and as the vital constitution (so to speak) of the spirit must depend upon its individualization in the body, man's stay in the form is fraught with infinite interest to him. It makes this life the seed-time of eternity, and he will be compelled to reap the harvest of his own sowing. Whether that harvest shall be one of eternal delight and rejoicing or otherwise, must be determined by the individualization of the spirit here. Every influence by which we are surrounded makes its impress upon the imperishable constitution. If those influences harmonize with wisdom and love, and awaken in us actions responsive to them, then will the impress on our spirits be favorable; but if those influences are false and wicked, and awaken in us actions responsive to them, the effect upon the spirit will be unfavorable.

Take two acorns; plant one of them in a congenial and fertile soil, and let it take root and grow there, and it will become the giant of the forest; plant the other in an uncongenial, desert soil, and it will become a dwarfed and stunted shrub. After it has taken root in the desert, and has there taken upon itself its vital constitution, you may transplant it to the congenial soil of the

other oak, but its constitution will not be changed. It can never become the giant of the forest; and although it may develop and expand more than it would have done had it not been transplanted, still it must continue through the period of its existence, a dwarfed and stunted shrub. From this we may learn a lesson of much practical importance.

From these considerations, we are forced to conclude that the Author of our existence has placed our highest happiness in our highest good, and has placed our highest good in the highest good of all created intelligences, and has thus bound us together and to himself by the cords of his perfect and eternal love; that whenever we act in harmony with the well-being of all within our sphere of influence and action, we act in harmony with our own well-being and destiny, and will be rewarded with true happiness; but when we act in antagonism to the well-being of the humblest spirit in the universe, we act in antagonism to the well-being and happiness of every spirit, even of God himself. Hence said Jesus, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, my brethren, ye have done it unto me;" and "Inasmuch as ye have not done it unto them, ye have not done it unto me." Hence we must conclude that whatever we do unto man we do unto God.

From these considerations we are to infer that we are not to seek the gratification of our natural appetites, passions and desires as a means of obtaining happiness—that they were never designed for that purpose; and when man does so, he is at war with his own eternal well-being, and will reap a bitter harvest as the fruit of his labor, in the disease which he will entail upon his physical system; in the discontent and misery he will inflict upon his mind here, and in the unfavorable influence he will exert on the individualization of his immortal spirit. The extent of that penalty upon his physical system here, can be somewhat realized in the drunkard, the libertine and debauchee; but the full penalty upon the soul can never be realized, until the unfolding ages of eternity shall sum them up.

This life, then, should be considered as a prelude to a higher and better state of existence, and everything appertaining to this physical being should be deemed incidental to that higher life.

This physical body, as an instrument for the individualization and identification of the spirit, should be used with the strictest reference to that end. It has a high and important duty to perform, and nature has fitted it for the performance of that duty. She has supplied it with all the appetites, instincts and desires which are necessary to lead it in the right path, and harmonize it with the destiny of the immortal spirit, and she has guarded that path on every side. When we think to cheat our souls by seeking for happiness in an improper use of these appetites and desires of the animal body, nature not only refuses the accustomed gratification, but she chastises us with disease and pain, and if we persist she divorces the spirit from the body.

What more could the Creator do to lead man in the way of truth and eternal life than he has already done? First, by the impulses and aspirations of man's own immortal nature, and the happiness incident to the gratification of his spiritual desires, God has made the path of duty the road to true happiness, and thus would attract man to himself. Next, by the light of nature in the development of the animal kingdom, he has instructed man in the proper use of his animal appetites and passions. Then he has guarded against their abuse by refusing that gratification which would follow a proper and legitimate use of them, as well as by punishing with disease and bodily pain all such abuse; and lastly, when man, through ignorance of his true nature and destiny, and under the direction of his animal impulses, seemed bent on his own destruction, he gave him a practical exemplification of these great truths, which, if obeyed, would lead him to his own highest good and happiness, in the life and teachings of Jesus, through whom the true dignity of man was revealed to the world.

The system of truths taught and illustrated by Jesus was designed to instruct man in the nature and demands of his spiritual being; to point out those rules of action which would harmonize the animal with the spiritual nature, and would bring man into harmony with himself, his fellow-man, and with God; to call off the attention of man from those pursuits which tended to develop unduly the animal appetites and passions, and direct his attention to those things which would develop and expand his

spiritual being, and thus to bring the animal into subjection to the spiritual nature, and by so doing to lay the axe at the root of the tree of evil. Hence he taught his disciples to despise the ambition and fame and wealth of this animal world, not to seek to lay up treasures of that sort, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and thieves would break through and steal—to despise this animal life when it set up its claims in antagonism to the well-being of the higher or spiritual life; if a hand, or an eye or a foot become a cause of offense, to cut off or pluck them out. There was to be no compromise when the desires of the animal interfered with the demands of the spiritual being. This will lead us to examine the principles of Christianity as taught by Jesus, and ascertain their adaptedness to man as a means of human redemption, which, when fully understood, will exhibit the true philosophy of Christianity.—*Swedenborg, Arcana Cœlestia, 1799.*

DOCTRINALS alone do not constitute the external, much less the internal of the church, as has been shown, nor do they serve to distinguish churches before Lord; but this is effected by a life according to doctrinals, all which, if they are true, regard charity as their fundamental; for what is the end and design of doctrinals but to teach how man should live? The several churches in the Christian world are distinguished by their doctrinals, and the members of those churches have hence taken the name of Roman Catholics, Lutherans, Calvinists, or the reformed and evangelical Protestants, with many others. This distinction of names arises solely from doctrinals, and would never have had place if they had made love to the Lord and charity to the neighbor the principal point of faith. Doctrinals would then be only varieties of opinion concerning the mysteries of faith, which true Christians would leave to every one according to his conscience, and would say from the heart that he is a true Christian who lives as a Christian, or as the Lord teaches.

CHRISTIANITY A SYSTEM OF DISCIPLINE.

THE system of Christianity is based upon the hypothesis that man is a compound being, possessed of two natures—an animal and a spiritual nature; that the animal nature, in its present state of development, is in antagonism with the spiritual nature in its impulses, appetites and desires, and in consequence of this antagonism is in a state of warfare with the spirit; that in consequence of the triumphs of this animal nature, man is subject to the moral, social and civil evils which afflict the world; that these triumphs affect the condition of the spirit after this life; that to redeem man from these evils, here and hereafter, this animal nature must be brought into subjection to the spiritual, and be made subordinate to it in all its relations and actions; that to do this, man's impulses to action must be changed from the animal to the spiritual. Hence the first doctrine Jesus ever taught was, that man must be regenerated, that is, be born again, if he would see (perceive) the kingdom (government) of heaven; the natural (physical) man, under the dominion of his animal impulses and desires, could not see the kingdom of heaven. That he must be born of the spirit, be under the dominion of the spiritual nature, its impulses, aspirations and desires, if he would restore harmony, and establish "Peace on earth, and good will among men." This new birth had strict reference to a change of impulse or motive to action.

We have already seen that the mere animal is purely selfish in all its motives to action; that selfishness is a natural and proper impulse of the mere animal, because, having no higher end to accomplish than to preserve its animal existence in itself and issue, and selfishness being the highest motive to the accom-

plishment of that object, it is, therefore, the highest motive to action the animal can appreciate. As the physical existence of the animal is to itself the highest end of its being, therefore it is the quality of selfishness to seek that end, regardless of the being of others. Hence selfishness tends to bring its possessor into a state of antagonism with other existences. Man being merely animal in one department of his compound nature, possesses this animal selfishness, which, as an animal, brings him into antagonism with other existences; but being purely spiritual and immortal in the other department of his existence, and hence, being in no danger of destruction as a spirit, he has not this selfish impulse, but has in its stead the opposite, love, which is interior spiritual delight. This interior delight leads him to harmonize his existence with that of every other; and hence arises this state of warfare between the animal and spiritual nature of man—the spirit warring against the flesh, and the flesh *lusting* against the spirit. And the life and teachings of Jesus were designed to espouse the cause of the spirit, and to bring the flesh into subjection thereto, and thereby to bring about a reconciliation or atonement between the animal and the spiritual man; between animal man and spiritual God. Jesus taught the way to give the spirit dominion over man, and thus to establish a spiritual government in man. Hence he said, "The kingdom of heaven is in you." Hence, also, "My kingdom is not of this world; if my kingdom were of this world, my subjects would fight," etc.

Man in this state of existence is naturally under the dominion of his animal nature, because the animal is very fully developed when the spiritual is but feebly developed. Man's animal senses connect him with physical existences, and his animal appetites give him a relish for physical objects. His first sensations of pleasure or of pain come from that source, and he learns to exercise all his animal faculties before he thinks to put forth his spiritual; and so strong an impression do his animal appetites, desires and passions make upon him, that he becomes unconscious of his spiritual being, and does not even recognize its demands; hence the very thing which man needed was something

to develop and bring out his spiritual nature, and that was Jesus' mission.

As the whole merit of the Christian system depends upon the change it works upon man, it is highly important in the outset that we understand the nature of that change; that we understand that new birth which alone can fit a man for the kingdom of heaven; who it is that must be born again? and how must he be born again? Jesus labored to establish the kingdom of heaven upon earth, by establishing it in the hearts of men; hence he labored to make man the compound a subject of that kingdom, and to establish in him, as a compound being, this new government. This new birth had not reference to man, the animal, nor to man, the spiritual, but to man, the compound. It was man, the compound, who must be born again, who, in his controlling impulses and desires, must be reproduced; hence we are not to infer that man's spiritual being was to be reproduced, any more than his animal being. His spiritual being, if permitted to act out its interior delights—if placed in power upon the throne in man, the compound—needed no change. It is because the spirit in its inmost is right, that the conflict is maintained between it and the flesh, and it was to bring the flesh into subjection and reconciliation that Jesus lived and taught. The new birth, then, consisted in developing and bringing into power, in the compound man, the delights and desires of the spiritual man, and thus establishing the kingdom of heaven within.

Then the system of Christianity is a system of discipline, calculated to develop and bring into power the spiritual nature of man, and all its doctrines and all its requirements must harmonize with that end. The results flowing from that development will be "Peace on earth, and good will among men;" that is, under such a government, the interests, desires, and delights of all men will harmonize, and each will be pursuing his own highest good when he is pursuing the highest good of his neighbor. The very effort we are prompted by our interior delights to put forth to instruct or aid our neighbor, is the very exercise demanded by our souls for their own proper expansion, development and strength; and from that exercise flows that inward peace and joy which constitutes true happiness; so that under the domin-

ion of our spiritual natures, we should never be found in antagonism with the well-being or happiness of our fellow-man. Such is most emphatically the system of Christianity, as taught and practiced by its authors, and as such it becomes the balm of Gilead, and Christ the great Physician.

Christianity being a system of discipline designed to bring the animal into subjection to the spiritual, must necessarily be opposed and hated by those who are under the dominion of their lower natures. Selfishness has possession of the animal man, and he is the strong man armed, and will not surrender his position without a severe conflict; hence when Love, who is the good man of the house, puts forth this effort to bind that strong man, that he may spoil his goods, he will not be able to do it without a struggle with all the impulses, passions, appetites and desires of that animal selfishness.

Christianity being disciplinary in its character, its religion is a practical, working religion, and requires that its faith shall be exhibited in its works, and most distinctly affirms that an unfruitful faith is spurious, and of no value. It brings everything to the test of its fruits, its practical results; hence it has no creeds, or catechisms or formularies, no pretended modes of faith or forms of worship. As such it is distinguished from every other form of religion which existed before, or since its day. Pure Christianity is pure Spiritualism. Its motto is, "God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth;" its inspirations are spiritual, its workings practical; its preceptive teachings have strict reference to practice, and promise nothing, further than they are put into practice between man and man.

From the foregoing we are prepared to understand all the various doctrines Jesus taught. A leading doctrine, and one of the first he taught, was, that there is a difference between the spiritual and animal nature of man, and that there is an antagonism between these two. Said he, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit;" and "Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God." He held that the animal nature was inferior, and should be brought into subjection to, the spiritual, and, if need be, should

be sacrificed to protect, defend or develop the spiritual nature; and as the design of his system was to discipline and develop the spirit, and thus repress the animal, he would allow no practice, under any circumstances, to conflict with such discipline. Hence, no matter where he found a contrary practice, whether in the Jewish Church or among the Gentiles, he condemned it. No matter what authority they quoted, whether the elders of the Church or their sacred writings, he gave no heed to it. His reply was simple and to the point, "I say unto you, it shall not be so. He would recognize no higher authority than truth, and no diviner sanction than justice.

The interior delight of the spirit being love, pure, unselfish and universal, he would allow of no action not in perfect harmony with that divine element. No force of circumstances could justify a disregard of its requirements. Said he, "Ye have heard that it hath been said, thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy; but I say unto you, love your enemies; bless them that curse you; do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you." To allow man to hate, under any circumstances, was to permit the lower nature to hold dominion over the man, to the exclusion of the higher, and thus to develop the lower and crush the higher. Therefore, to allow an individual to indulge in the passion of hate, no matter who or what the object of that hate was, would defeat the workings of the Christian system in that individual, by developing the animal and depressing his spiritual nature. Therefore, no matter if they could quote the authority of Moses or the example of David, it was no authority with Jesus. Let the opinions or practices of all their ancient prophets and priests justify the hating of an enemy, it did not alter the fact that such a state of mind tended to crush the spirit, and bring it into subjection to the animal nature; therefore it could have no place in the system he labored to establish.

He held the position that no act could be acceptable to God while the individual performing it was not in a state of reconciliation with all mankind. Said he, "If thou bring thy gift before the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go

thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, then come and offer thy gift." This condition of being in harmony with all mankind was absolutely indispensable to him who would claim the benefit of his system. While the mind was in a state of antagonism to the well-being of any individual, it was in a state of antagonism with God, and consequently could occupy no other relation to him. It was the same truth uttered by an apostle, "If a man say he love God, and hate his brother, he is a liar;" and again, "Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these, ye have done it unto me." Jesus, in his system, recognized the principle that whatever we do to man we do to God.

It was upon this principle that he could not allow resistance by force. Said he, "Ye have heard that it hath been said, an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth; but I say unto you, that ye resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." It was true they had heard this said from high authority. In the law of Moses it stood recorded thus: "And if any mischief follow, shalt thou give life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe;" but Jesus could not recognize it as authority. The state of mind which would demand or execute such penalties, was not in harmony with that LOVE which was indispensable to the development of the spirit, and therefore could not be permitted to exist. He recognized in no man, or combination of men, the right to commit violence upon the person of another; he considered the relation existing between every man and God too sacred to be interfered with. There was nothing to be gained, and everything to be lost, by such interference.

Upon the principle of being in a state of perfect harmony with all the world, and loving every human being as ourselves, he would allow of no respect of persons. His motto was, "Judge not, that ye be not judged; condemn not, that ye be not condemned. I judge no man." He made a wide distinction between the acts of an individual and the individual himself. While he would denounce vice and crime, he would not let his denunciations extend to the person of the individual. Hence,

when an individual was brought before him accused of crime, his judgment was, "I do not condemn thee; go and sin no more." He did not recognize the rightful existence of any such thing as merit and demerit, but his whole life and teachings were based upon their non-existence. Said he, "Your Father which is in heaven maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and he sendeth his rain upon the just and the unjust;" "Be ye therefore perfect, as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." This perfection here referred to consisted in treating all men alike—enemies and friends; the evil and the good; the just and the unjust. He taught that man's blessings and penalties depended upon something more consistent with the perfections of the divine character, than that of rewarding merit and punishing demerit. There is a deeper and purer philosophy in the economy of God's government than such impulses to action, and one that throws responsibility where it belongs. Of this I will speak hereafter.

Upon this principle of being in a state of interior harmony with all mankind, he taught that we should frankly and freely forgive all who had inflicted wrong upon us, and that in our supplications to God, we should ask him to forgive us only as we forgave others, recognizing still the principle that we could be in a state of reconciliation with God no farther than we were in a state of reconciliation with all mankind; for, said he, "If ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses," which means simply this—you sustain to God in your spiritual state the same relation you sustain to your fellow-man. If you love them, and seek their well-being and happiness, you love God, and seek the well-being and happiness of universal existence, and by so being and doing, you are in a state of perfect harmony and reconciliation with God; but if, on the contrary, you hate and despise your fellow-man, and will not forget and forgive the wrongs they have inflicted upon you, you hate and despise God, and are in a state of spiritual rebellion; and while that state of mind continues, you can not be in harmony with the Divine Being.

It was also upon this principle that he required that our charities should be performed in secret, without ostentation, parade,

or show; that we might be sure they were prompted by the interior delight and love of our souls; for no other impulse than that would properly exercise and discipline the spirit, and strengthen and develop it, and give it dominion over our animal natures. The economy of our relations in life is such, that every act we are required to perform is attended with double blessings, if performed aright and from a right impulse. In the performance of our charities, we are the ones who receive the greatest blessing. If the alms are prompted by our interior delights, our inmost loves, that exercise, develop and expand our souls, bring them nearer to, and make them more like, God, and increase their capacity for happiness, and give us more exalted pleasure than they confer upon those who receive them. Hence it was said, "It is more blessed to give than to receive;" "He that giveth to the poor lendeth to the Lord, that which he will repay him again." But if our charities are dictated by pride, ostentation and vain show, we not only lose all these blessings, but we injure ourselves by the exercise and development of our lower faculties, and thus give the animal dominion over the spiritual nature. Hence said Jesus, "Take heed that you do not your alms before men to be seen of them, otherwise ye have no reward of your Father which is in heaven."

He also assumed the position that we could not be under the control or dominion of two masters at the same time, meaning that we could not properly be governed by two classes of impulses to action at the same time; by obeying the one we should disobey the other; by adhering to one we should reject the other. These two masters he denominated God and Mammon, who are typified in our spiritual and animal natures; and by the application he made of the proposition, it stands thus: Ye can not be under the dominion of your animal and spiritual natures at the same time, and consequently ye can not serve God and Mammon. In a previous article, I demonstrated that our animal natures were under the dominion of selfishness, which prompted us to seek our own well-being and happiness, regardless of the well-being and happiness of others; that our spiritual natures, uninfluenced by the animal, were under the dominion of love, pure and universal, which constituted their

interior delights; that under the dominion of this principle we sought the well-being and happiness of others, which of itself constituted our own well-being and happiness, and that thus our animal and spiritual natures were, in their impulses, in a state of antagonism. If our animal natures prevailed, that would bring the world into antagonism and conflict; if our spiritual natures prevailed, that would bring the world into harmony with themselves and with God. That Christianity was designed as a system of discipline to give our spiritual natures dominion over the animal, and thus to reconcile man to himself and God, and thus to effect a reconciliation between man and God.

Under this proposition, Jesus' command is, "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt and where thieves break through and steal, but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through and steal; for where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." These earthly treasures have reference to the gratification of our animal inclinations, and that exercise which is required to accumulate these treasures, together with that state of mind which would lead us to appropriate them to our own use, tends to develop our animal selfishness, and bring us into antagonism with the well-being of our fellow-men. By such an exercise we give our lower natures dominion over our higher, and thus defeat the whole end and aim of the Christian system. Christianity, as a practical institution, can not stand without a strict observance of this requirement. We have only to look abroad over society to see the workings of this strife, to lay up earthly treasures in the shape of wealth, fame, power or animal gratification. There is no crime known to the law, there is no vice practiced by the individual, which does not naturally and almost necessarily flow from a disregard of this injunction. This eagerness to accumulate earthly treasures causes one man to appropriate to himself the rights and property of others; to enter upon a system of lying, defrauding, overreaching, oppressing and crushing his brother; it stimulates the thief, the burglar, the assassin; it causes all men to disregard the demands of their spiritual nature in ad-

ministering to the gratification of the animal, and thus subjects the spiritual to the animal nature.

This result is inevitable from the nature and constitution of man. Hence that system of discipline which would correct the evil, and bring men into harmony with each other, must require the observance of this command, "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth;" and unless that command is properly kept, the system will fail. In the economy of nature everything has a legitimate end to accomplish, and it is exactly adapted to the accomplishment of that end; when it is strained beyond that point, it will not only fail of its legitimate end, but it will become a cause of disturbance and discord in the harmony of existence. Thus, as remarked in my preceding lecture, the animal nature of man has its legitimate office to perform, in individualizing the immortal spirit; and all its natural appetites, instincts and desires are proper, and adapted to a specific end. They are such as can easily be gratified if they are not strained beyond their legitimate functions, and if they are kept within proper bounds, they will harmonize with the nature and destiny of the immortal spirit. But the moment they are made to assume an importance which nature did not design to them, and to claim attentions demanded by our higher nature, that moment they antagonize with their own proper functions, and are in a state of antagonism with the well-being and destiny of the immortal spirit, and while in this state of antagonism, they not only do not confer happiness, but are the source of discord and misery. Therefore if man would study his own happiness even here, he would obey the injunction, "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth."

But this injunction is true to nature, and when violated is violated without excuse. Why should man seek to lay up for himself treasures upon earth? What can he gain in a temporal point of view? Nature will permit him to use only a very limited amount for the supply of his natural wants, and bless him in its use. She gives him a healthy appetite for food; but it takes only a small quantity to supply that demand; and that food should be simple and cheap. If he attempts to eat more than nature demands, or to season his food so that it may provoke a greater

gratification than nature intended, he is violating her laws, and she will punish him for it. The physical wants of the body, when viewed in its true office, are but few and simple; and it has been demonstrated, long since, that "A competence is all it can enjoy;" then what excuse is there for striving to lay up treasures upon earth? If our spiritual natures did not demand the labor we thus squander away upon perishable things, it would still be time poorly spent; but when we consider, that this very labor not only does no good to our animal being, but inflicts an eternal injury upon our spiritual being, it is truly the hight of madness in man to seek to lay up for himself treasures upon earth.

But the avaricious and worldly-minded man always has some pretended excuse for violating the laws of his being and destiny, and thus rendering himself wretched. Thus, while it is admitted that man can not find true happiness in striving to lay up for himself treasures upon earth, yet it is claimed he must do so to provide for the wants of to-morrow; and thus men go on accumulating their thousands and millions upon that plea. But Jesus would not admit that excuse. He affirmed that such conduct exhibited a lack of faith in the provident care of God. Said he "Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on." "Behold the fowls of the air, they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns, **YET** your heavenly Father feedeth them; are not ye much better than they?" "Consider the lilies of the field how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin, and yet Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. Wherefore if God so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is and to-morrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith? Therefore take no thought for the morrow, for the morrow shall take thought for the things of itself. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof."

If it were true that men were obliged to slave themselves to provide for the wants of the body, to the neglect of their spiritual demands, and thus were compelled to develop their animal natures, and give them dominion over their spiritual, while at the same time their present and eternal well-being demanded that

their spiritual natures should be developed and should have dominion over their animal, they might justly complain that God was unjust to them—that his plans exhibited a lack of wisdom or benevolence. But it is not so. It requires no more labor to supply the natural and necessary demands of the body, than the health of the body and spirit demand. A large proportion of what are supposed to be the demands of the body are artificial and unnecessary, and in their influence are prejudicial both to the body and spirit; and it is this undue attention to the animal nature, which has created this unnecessary demand. That system which is intended to redeem man from this slavery to the body, and to bring the animal into subjection to the spiritual, can not justify the continuance of these artificial and unnecessary demands; because, first, they tend to develop the animal in undue proportions; and, second, they cheat the spirit of a portion of its birthright. Christianity, then, as a system of discipline, would be imperfect, did it not require the observance of this principle.

Upon this point Jesus declared that the first thing to be sought after was the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and that all necessary things would be added thereto. It will do for the atheist and unbelieving to question the truth of this saying consistently with their faith; although the experience of one in olden time was, "I have been young, and now am I old, yet have I never seen the righteous forsaken, nor his seed begging bread;" and the observation of those who have lived since that time will go far to sustain the truth of that remark; but for a professed Christian, or one believing in the providential care of God, to say it is not true, argues a lack of faith in God equal to the atheistical and unbelieving, and renders him worthy to be addressed, "O ye of little faith." There is no doctrine taught by Jesus more explicit than this: that God will provide for those who, in seeking for the kingdom of heaven and its righteousness, take no thought for the morrow, and in his life and subsequent teachings, he fully exemplified this truth. During the three years he taught, it could be said, "He had not where to lay his head." When he sent forth his disciples as lambs in the midst of wolves, they took neither purse nor scrip, nor any physical

means of sustaining life; and yet they lacked nothing. I have many important suggestions to make on this point, but ye are not able to bear them now.

Jesus, in his system, was particular in insisting upon the active virtues between man and man. It was not enough that a man should do no harm, that is, that he should abstain from all vices and crimes; but he must be actively engaged in doing good. By his activity and influence he must be making men better, wiser and happier. He must not only cherish love for all his fellow-men, but that love must find expression in his acts. Said he, "Let him that hath two coats give to him that hath none." "Give to him that asketh of thee, and him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away." Feed the hungry, clothe the naked, visit the sick, relieve the distressed, "If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him drink;" and that every one might have within his own bosom a guide to correct action, he gave this rule, "As ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them." "Love your neighbor as yourself."

Thus it will be perceived that the system taught by Jesus was a system of the most rigid discipline, aimed at the subjugation of the animal or natural man, to the dominion of the spiritual. He held that this life, in comparison with the future, was of no moment; although taken in its connection with, and its influence upon, the future, it was of infinite importance. Every principle contained in the Christian system was aimed at the development of the spirit, to give it power over the compound being, man. Every truth Jesus taught, every precept he gave, every duty he required to be performed, was in harmony with that perfect love to God and man which he declared to be the fulfilling of the whole law, and the faith he required on the part of his followers was a full belief in all the truths he taught—a faith that should WORK by love, and PURIFY the heart. When he required them to believe on him, he had reference to the doctrines he taught, the truths he personified.

He taught no form of religious worship separate from the every-day transactions of life. He set apart no day for the especial service of God, for the very simple reason that every act of our lives should constitute a portion of that worship. The only

service we could render to God consisted in yielding perfect obedience to the requirement of perfect love, and by so doing expanding and unfolding our own spirits, so that they could understand, move and drink deeper into the perfections of his divine character, and thus bring ourselves into harmony with his government, which would bring us into harmony with the highest good of every created intelligence. When he spake to the people he spake for their instruction; when he labored for them, he labored for their relief.

He discountenanced formal worship as being no worship at all. He did not commence his discourses by public prayers, or by singing, or by performing other rites and ceremonies. His injunction was, "When ye pray, enter into your closet, **AND WHEN YOU HAVE SHUT THE DOOR**, pray to your Father who is in secret, and your Father which seeth in secret shall reward you openly." "But be not as the hypocrites are, for they love to pray standing in the synagogues and the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men." When Jesus prayed (and he did pray) he retired to the mountain and to the desert by himself, and there offered up his desires to that Father who seeth in secret. According to his teachings and practice, worship is confined to no time or place, but belongs to all times and places. The reason for this is plain. Worship is a practical thing, is honoring God in our actions and our lives; it is exemplifying the wisdom, beauty and perfection of all his attributes as revealed in his work. Hence no form of existence can be used as a type of true spiritual worship.

To worship is to honor God; but God can not be honored except by such an exhibition of his character and attributes as would be manifested by a life of perfect obedience to all the requirements of perfect love; and the system of Christianity teaches that perfect obedience; and hence no man can truly worship God, without yielding perfect obedience to all the requirements of Jesus Christ. When Jesus came, he found true religious worship buried out of sight, beneath the forms and ceremonies of the Jewish ritual. He found them tithing mint, annis and cumin; he found them washing cups and platters; he found them paying great external deference to God in their strict ob-

servance of the ceremonial law. But all this did not extend to character. With all their formality, he found them arrogant, vain, conceited, selfish, uncharitable, lustful, hypocritical and false to everything appertaining to true spiritual worship. All their conceptions of God were false and idolatrous. There was no part of their worship which had not become an idol. Their Sabbaths and new moons, their temples and their altars, their sacrifices and oblations had become objects of idol worship.

Such religion was not calculated to honor God or benefit man. It was not adapted to the necessities of man. It was as animal and sensual in all its influences as idolatry itself; hence it possessed not the discipline necessary to redeem man from the dominion of his animal nature, and was false to the objects of true religion. As such Jesus could not approve of it—he could not respect it. His first effort was to teach them the true character of God, and the nature of the service he required at their hands; to teach them that the time had come when forms and ceremonies should cease, and that the character and attributes of God should be studied without the aid of those useless types and symbols; that the ceremonial law, under which they lived, was applicable only to those times when ignorance made such forms and ceremonies necessary to convey to the mind certain truths, which it could not otherwise understand; that the law, having thus performed its office of schoolmaster, to prepare them for receiving truth direct had performed its mission, and therefore was fulfilled and should end.

Jesus in his teachings sometimes resorted to symbols, to figures of speech, and to parables or likenesses, to illustrate and more forcibly impress his truths upon the minds of those he taught. Thus, to illustrate the state of mind they ought to cultivate, he sat a little child in the midst of his disciples, and told them that they must humble themselves and become like little children if they would see the kingdom of heaven; that the kingdom of heaven was composed of such meek, humble, gentle and confiding minds. As typical of the condition of man after the spiritual nature had triumphed over the animal, and the animal man was figuratively slain, he used a symbol most beautiful and appropriate to express that new condition. I refer to the ceremony

of baptism, which, as used by Christ, was typical of a burial and resurrection, a death and burial of the old man and his deeds, and a resurrection into new life, the life of the spirit. Before man could become a member of this spiritual kingdom, the impulses of his animal nature, which carried on a warfare against the spirit, must be put down, or figuratively, slain; and so far as their power to control or give direction to the man was concerned, must be destroyed as at physical death. Now, as emblematical of this state of animal death and spiritual life, the ceremony of baptism was used, not as a birth of water, but, on the contrary, as a death and burial to that birth, and a birth into the true spiritual state; as such the ceremony was most beautiful and instructive. When an individual, listening to the teachings of Jesus, became satisfied of their truth, and resolved to conform his life to their requirements, to subject his animal selfishness, appetites and passions to the dominion of his spiritual nature, what could more beautifully typify that destruction of the old nature, and that rising into life in the new, than going down into the water and being buried, as dead unto sin, and coming up again as being born or risen into a new life, a life of love and righteousness. But we must be careful to notice that he used this ceremony to teach an important truth, as he used parables or figures of speech, and not for any intrinsic value there was in the ceremony itself.

Jesus also made use of another ceremony equally appropriate and instructive. I refer to the ceremony of washing his disciples' feet. This was the last act of his ministry, and as such included all the others. In the lesson it taught, it was the sum total of Christianity, as applicable to man in this life. Washing of feet was an act of eastern hospitality, performed by the humblest class of servants, and therefore was the humblest act of service one man could perform for another. He, to teach his disciples that they should never consider any act too humble to be performed by them, if the comfort or necessities of a brother-being demanded it, took a towel and girded himself like a servant, and commenced washing his disciples' feet. After he had finished the ceremony he inquired, "Know ye what is this I have done unto you?" "Ye call me Lord and Master, and ye say well, for so I am; if I, then, your Lord and Master, have

washed your feet, how much more ought ye to wash one another's feet;" which, being interpreted, means, If I, occupying the highest position man can occupy, have performed the humblest office man can perform, so man, whatever may be his standing in life, can never excuse himself from the performance of any office, however humble, which the happiness or well-being of his fellow demands.

As a figure illustrative of an important lesson he wished to teach, he called to his aid a practice which nature imposes upon man almost constantly. The truth he wished to teach was this: As our animal natures constantly require food and nourishment for the health and development of the body, so do our spiritual natures require food and nourishment for the health and development of the spirit. Now, as bread and wine are used to nourish, strengthen and develop the body, so must the doctrines and truths I have taught you, and the examples I have set you, be observed and obeyed, to nourish, strengthen and develop your spirit; therefore, while you are thus constantly attending to the demands of your physical natures, keep me in constant remembrance to supply the demands of your spiritual natures; and thus he converted our common meals into remembrances of those truths which are necessary to be obeyed to give the spirit dominion over the flesh, and prepare our hearts for the introduction of the kingdom of heaven.

Thus we see that Christianity is a system of discipline, designed to depress the animal nature and develop the spiritual; designed to remove animal selfishness as a motive power to action in man, and substitute the interior delight of the spirit, love, pure and universal; and thus to lay the ax at the root of every evil, by destroying that from which it proceeds, and introducing the kingdom or government of heaven, by introducing the impulse into every heart which governs in that kingdom. As a system of discipline, it is valuable no further than it is practicable; as a means of salvation it can not go beyond the fruits of obedience. It adopts no ceremonial worship, because such worship is fruitless and deceptive; it lays no stress upon forms, because its salvation consists in the substance; it contains no types and shadows, because Jesus himself was the revealed reality.

We come, then, to the conclusion that man, in this state of existence, in ignorance of his true nature and destiny, and under the impulses of his animal nature is constantly brought into a state of antagonism with the laws of his higher being, and into conflict with the interests, well-being and happiness of his fellow-men; that out of this antagonism with the laws of his own spiritual nature, and out of a constant violation of the true laws of his animal constitution, arise all the vices and miseries to which he is subject as an individual; that out of the conflict existing between him and the interests and well-being of his fellow-men, arise all the crimes which exist in society, whether committed by individuals or nations; that all these vices and crimes are the result of the dominion of his animal nature; that the only way to correct these evils is to adopt a course of discipline which will repress the animal and develop the spiritual nature, and thus bring man under the dominion of his interior or spiritual delights; that the system of Christian truths furnishes that discipline which, if adopted and practiced, will redeem man from his vices and crimes, by bringing him under the dominion of love, pure, unselfish and universal, and thus bring him into harmony with his own well-being and destiny, and the well-being and destiny of all created intelligences, and by so doing will establish "Peace on earth, and good will among men."

In this sense it is not difficult to understand how the Christian system is appropriately styled a "way of salvation," laid before the foundations of the world; for it is interwoven into the very constitution of the universe, and exists from the very nature and necessity of things. In this view, it is not difficult to understand in what sense sin is a violation of the laws of God, and its punishment is the penalty of those violated laws, and how the sins of parents are entailed upon their children unto the third and fourth generation. Nor is it difficult to understand how and in what sense Jesus is the Savior of the world, and gave his life for us, that we, through him, might be saved; that he sealed his testimony with his blood; that he is the way, the truth and the life; the door by which and through which every man must approach the Father; that he is the Word made flesh, the translation of the infinite Father into finite humanity; that in him all

the fullness of the Godhead dwelt bodily. In this view it is not difficult to understand the declarations of Jesus, when he said "I and my Father are one," and again, "My Father is greater than I;" "The works that I do, I do not of myself; but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doeth the work." It is not difficult to understand how He was one with the Father in his character or interior delights, yet not one with the Father in wisdom and power. In this view, the plan of salvation becomes simple and easy to be understood; and harmonizes with the infinite perfections of God. His wisdom, his power, his justice and benevolence, combine without any impeachment.

But in this view, Christianity offers no salvation to the disobedient. By obedience of its requirements, it can save *from* sin, but it can not save *in* sin. As a system of discipline, it can benefit no farther than it is practiced. Its terms of salvation are obedience; and it can save on no other terms, because obedience is salvation, and there is no other. In this view of the subject, the virtue of Jesus as the Redeemer of the world does not consist in the blood he lost, or the pain he suffered, or any debt he paid; but it consists in the truths he revealed, and the practical illustrations he gave of those truths. The virtue of his sufferings and death consists in the attestation of his utter fidelity to God and truth. His blood speaketh better things than the blood of Abel, because it was shed in attestation of higher truths.

From the foregoing it will be perceived that every one becomes responsible for his own salvation. He can obtain nothing upon credit. He can not be saved by the merits of another; no allowance can be made for old Adam's transgressions. The laws of his physical and spiritual being make no demands upon him, which he can not easily obey, and it is for his highest good, here and hereafter, that he obeys them. He need not be ignorant of the nature of their demands. If he is, it is his own fault, and upon him must rest the consequences. He is not ignorant of the fact, that all pursuits, having for their end the attainment of wealth, fame, power or worldly gratification, have ever failed of satisfying the desires of the immortal nature, and consequently have failed to confer happiness upon man. He is not ignorant of the fact that all such efforts tend to disquiet the mind, and make it unhappy. He is not ignorant of the fact, that every action,

every pursuit in life, which looks to the happiness and well-being of others, and which is suited to that end, uniformly awakens an interior delight, warms and expands the soul, and establishes peace and true happiness within. From these considerations, if he is not willfully and madly blind, he might truly infer his duty to himself, his neighbor, and his God. But if with all this knowledge, like the poor drunkard, he defies his fate, and presses the maddening chalice to his lips, not all the religious creeds of the world, not all the sacrifices ever made, not even God himself, can save him from the penalty of his sins.

Extract from the Preface to T. L. Harris' "Lyric of the Golden Age:"

As many ages as it took to form
 The world it takes to form the human race.
 Humanity was injured in its birth, "
 And its existence in the past has been
 That of a suffering infant. God, through Christ
 Appearing, healed that sickness, pouring down
 Interior life; so Christ our Lord became
 The second Adam, through whom all shall live.
 This is our faith.—The world shall yet become
 The home of that great second Adam's seed.
 Christ-forms, both male and female, who from Him
 Derive their ever-growing perfectness,
 Eventually shall possess the earth
 And speak the rhythmic language of the skies,
 And mightier miracles than His perform;
 They shall remove all sickness from the race,
 Cast out all devils from the Church and State,
 And hurl into Oblivion's hollow sea
 The mountains of depravity. Then earth,
 From the Antarctic to the Arctic pole,
 Shall blush with flowers; the isles and continents
 Teem with harmonic forms of bird and beast
 And fruit; and glorious shapes of Art, more fair
 Than man's imagination yet conceived,
 Adorn the stately temples of a new
 Divine Religion. Every human soul,
 A second Adam or a second Eve,
 Shall dwell with its pure counterpart, conjoined
 In sacramental marriage of the heart.
 God shall be everywhere, and not, as now,
 Guessed at, but apprehended, felt and known.

EXTRAORDINARY DELUSION.

WE publish the following as furnishing facts to which we shall have occasion to refer in some of our subsequent articles. These facts are brought forward from time to time, as witnesses to which we shall refer, when we come to urge certain propositions pertaining to our Spiritual Philosophy. We copy the story from the *Court Journal*:

"The utmost interest has been experienced in the fashionable circles all over the continent by the publication of the *brochure* of the Princess de S., which, printed at first in small numbers and for private circulation only, has gradually spread itself throughout the aristocratic and religious *coteries* of Europe. It is now exactly a year since the young Princess Eleanore de S., in the prime of her youth and beauty, a young wife adored by her husband and much beloved by her family, died suddenly at the Hotel de S., in Paris, and was buried with great pomp at Pere La Chaise, where a splendid monument, by Lechene, recording her age, her lineage, and virtues, has just been put up by her disconsolate husband. In spite of the high position held by the Princess, and from her great wealth and beauty having become the observed of all observers, there has always existed an extraordinary feeling of mystery in the public mind with regard to the circumstances of her death. The sudden determination, taken immediately after the event, by her mother-in-law, of retiring to a convent, greatly increased the doubt and wonder spread around the whole affair; and now this pamphlet (issued to the world with the sanction of one of the greatest names of any country, from one on the eve of taking the black vail, and who expresses the same awe of this position as that of her deathbed, and appeals therefrom for belief in the strange statements made in the work) comes to fill us with

a deeper amazement than we can well bear. The pamphlet is printed in German, the native language of the writer, who, as mother-in-law of the heroine of the wondrous story it contains, declares it to be in fulfillment of the vow made to her son's wife that is now made public. The whole life of the young Princess is here set forth. A child of immense imagination and power, left at an early age an orphan with the consciousness of beauty and the command of boundless wealth, finding herself suddenly transported to her guardian's old castle in the Hartz, was not likely to enjoy either content or happiness; and here her temper and disposition proved so wild and untractable that, after repeated efforts at home education, it was deemed advisable to send her to be trained into rule and discipline by seclusion in a convent. Just then her guardian being appointed ambassador to Paris from the Court of W., it was thought the best opportunity for placing the child beneath the surveillance of the superior of the *Sacré Cœur*, in the Rue de Varennes, where she could be better trained to habits of obedience than elsewhere. But, alas! this first experiment proved totally abortive. Three unsuccessful efforts at escape were followed by a decided attempt to set fire to the furniture of her room where she was confined; and the governess, fearful of the effort of such example on other pupils, and weary of the task of taming this wild, vehement spirit, reluctantly restored the young lady to the care of her guardian. The position of the latter had now become most difficult. To have her in the house was impossible, as Prince Leon de S., his only son, a youth scarcely older than the refractory Eleanore, resided with him, and to throw the pair together at that early age would have been considered by continental decorum quite out of the question. So a *conseil de famille* was held, and it was resolved to send the culprit, now no longer a mere child, but a fine, high-spirited girl of 15, to England, to complete her education, with the hope that the conviction of being thus alone in a foreign country, dependent on her good behavior to ensure the kindness of those about her, might have the desired effect. The young lady was accordingly placed at —, at Hammersmith, and for a time the hoped-for change seemed to have taken place in her temper. But, after a while, it appears that the bursts of violence to which she gave

way, and the fits of depression which succeeded, became so alarming as to cause serious fears for her health. Letter after letter was dispatched to her guardian from the young lady herself, begging to be taken into favor, declaring that the climate of England was weighing her to the earth, and the discipline of Hammersmith breaking her heart.

"For some time the guardian, acting with the prudence he judged necessary, suffered those complaints and supplications to go on; but at length, moved by one of the letters more heart-rending than the others, he allowed his anger to be melted on fetching his ward from the place, where she declared, in the strong language she was wont to use, she was "damaging both soul and body, and hurrying both in everlasting perdition." The Prince de S. arrived at Hammersmith one Sunday morning. He had returned no answer to the last letter despatched by his ward, and she was, therefore, not aware of his intention of arriving. The lady commissioned to be bearer of the news reported to have found her on her knees alone in her own room praying, with a most fearful expression of countenance, and, on being informed of her guardian's arrival, she had uttered a most unearthly shriek, and rushed down the stairs like one possessed. The guardian was much pleased with the progress and improvement, and brought her back to Paris triumphantly, as a specimen of the good training of the ladies of Hammersmith. There was, indeed, no token of the old indomitable spirit left within her. She was silent and subdued, submissive to all, and only urgent in her applications never to be left alone in the dark. She to whom religion had hitherto been a subject of derision, changed suddenly to practices of the most exaggerated piety, but always persisted in maintaining that it was useless to lay any plans for her welfare, for that she should die before she was twenty-one!

"'All a mother could do,' says the Princess, in the extraordinary brochure which discloses the story, 'was done by me to eradicate this idea from the mind of our beloved Eleanore, but the answers she always made were so full of terrible meaning that they filled my soul with such deep alarm that I dared not to dwell upon the subject. Even when she became the bride of my son Leon, she would insist upon every arrangement being made with a view to

his early death, which seemed to prey on her mind forever. It was not till the young couple had been married for some time that, by dint of maternal care and solicitude, I managed to wring from her the confidence of her direful anticipations ; and judge of my dismay when she coolly told me that she had sold herself to the Evil One, and that she would be claimed before she had reached the age of 21 ! She confessed that her despair had been so great at being exiled, that, wearied with incessant prayers to heaven and the saints for deliverance, without effect, she had at length addressed her vows to the powers of darkness on the very Sunday morning when her guardian had arrived, and the announcement of his presence was evidently the token of the acceptance of that fearful vow.'

" It seems that, in spite of every care and counsel—despite of the constant watching and wise teaching of the *Abbe Dupauloux*, nothing could turn aside this *idee fixe* from the mind of the Princess Eleanore ; and, although every extreme of dissipation and excitement was tried to divert her thoughts, she gave way to a settled melancholy, and died just two days before the completion of her 21st year, suddenly, and in her chair, full dressed for a ball at the *Ministere d'Etat*. The idea had evidently done its work in silence, and none can tell the agony which must have been endured during the last few months of that sad existence, in the midst of splendor and riches, yet nursing the canker worn within, from which neither the lofty position in which she stood nor the homage she received could divert her for an instant. The pamphlet has caused the deepest impression on the minds of all who have perused it, and the retirement from the world of the Dowager Princess de S., for the avowed purpose of praying for the soul of the Princess Eleanore, has added to the terrible effect of the tale, which seems more like a dark legend of the middle ages than an incident of yesterday ; but it is, nevertheless, perfectly true for all that.

REVIEW OF DR. GORDON'S THREE-FOLD TEST OF SPIRITUALISM.

We have before us another exposition of the alleged faults, follies and *paganisms* of spiritual manifestations in the work of the Rev. Wm. R. Gordon, D.D., published by Charles Scribner, of New York, under the title of "A THREEFOLD TEST OF MODERN SPIRITUALISM." Seeing a notice of the work, and of the grounds taken by the author, we hastened to purchase it, hoping to find the subject treated with that ability, candor and dignity becoming a learned divine, and how well our hopes were realized the sequel must show.

This man, learned in divinity (as the two D.'s are designed to indicate), has arrived at conclusions somewhat different from other D.D.'s who have investigated the same subject before him. In truth, he has furnished farther evidence, if such were needed, that men schooled and learned in the same divinity—receiving, as of divine authority, the same inspired teachings, under the illumination of the same divine Spirit as they claim—asking guidance of Him who giveth liberally and upbraideth not, arrive at very different conclusions upon this most interesting, and to them, perplexing subject.

The learned Mahan could find nothing in all the phenomena attending modern manifestations which could not be traced to a material and "mundane origin;" the learned Dr. Beecher could find evidence of spiritual action and manifestation, but they were evidently of the genus *bad*, because they did not harmonize with his theology; the Rev. Dr. Berg could find evidence that good as well as bad spirits could communicate with men, and that such was the Bible doctrine which Christian ministers ought to understand; and now Dr. Gordon, after some fifteen sittings, has

demonstrated that none but bad Spirits do communicate, and that "modern manifestations" are referable exclusively to such agency.

One thing is quite certain, that the Spirits, bad, devilish and misguided as they are, are as well agreed in the doctrines they communicate to man, as are these Doctors of Divinity in the origin and philosophy of these manifestations; and if disagreement in the one case demonstrates the diabolical origin of spiritual communications, I know not how these men, learned in divinity, are to defend their theology and philosophy from the same imputation. I propose to review the positions of the learned Dr. Gordon, and ascertain whether he has thrown any new light upon the subject, and also whether he is willing to be tried by the principles he has laid down in determining the character of spiritual manifestations.

The Doctor, in his introduction, spends a good deal of time in excusing himself for investigating the subject, and very properly concluded that it had attained to a condition, in fact, that it could not be put down by ridicule or contempt, and that there was no other alternative left but to meet it upon its merits. In this the Doctor came to a very wise and just conclusion; but he failed in this: His investigation was most superficial. He brought nothing of physical or metaphysical science to his aid, and consequently he demonstrated nothing for or against the manifestation.

He makes certain admissions, however, which are valuable, not for the establishment of any truth, but for silencing the bigoted clamors of those of his profession who denounce the doctrines of spiritual intercourse as anti-biblical, and thus frighten many ignorant and bigoted persons from an investigation of the subject. "In this," (the doctrine of spiritual communications,) says the Doctor, "he saw nothing to contradict the Bible; for who is not familiar with the fact of spiritual intercourse between heaven and earth in bygone ages, of which the Bible is a faithful record?" *Introduction, page 8.*

The admission, then, of this man learned in divinity, that the Bible is a record of spiritual communications, ought to afford a little protection to the reputation of the individual who thinks it proper to hear before he judges; and those clergymen who

have not made sufficient proficiency in the "divine art" to be entitled to two D.'s according to the judgment of their inspired brethren, ought not, for modesty's sake, to say nothing of charity, to denounce as infidel those who are of the same opinion as the Doctor; for if the doctrine of spiritual communications is anti-biblical, this man, learned in biblical divinity, ought to know it.

Also on page 11 of the Introduction, the Doctor says: "He commenced (the investigation) a perfect skeptic; but now his skepticism is all gone. The investigation led to the conclusion that the thousands of manifestations in this country and in Europe—a mere specimen of which he has selected—are made by Spirits. It is, so far as he can see, impossible to maintain a denial. The attempt has often been made, and as often failed." Now what becomes of the theory of the learned Mahan? He—taking his own word for it, and the word of those who knew no better than he—made it demonstrably plain that the Spirits had nothing to do with these manifestations; they were all of an exclusively "mundane origin;" the "electric," "mesmeric" and "odylic forces" were adequate to explain all the phenomena. But what says Dr. Gordon on page 11, Introduction? "The theories of involuntary or unconscious muscular movement—electric, mesmeric, odylic—all alike prove inadequate to explain the phenomena, for none of them can originate the *intelligence* that is *unmistakably* produced, unless intellect be common to matter and mind—a supposition not likely to receive admission. We are therefore *driven* to the choice between *materialism* and *spiritual agency*."

Here, then, we are, according to Dr. Gordon, in the midst of manifestations from the Spirit-world. The world, so to speak, is besieged by a spiritual host, and they have power to adopt any form of manifestation, to take possession and control of the minds and bodies of men and women, and lead them in the direction of truth or falsehood, as suits their purposes best.

But the Doctor comes in here with a clerical salvo. He says: "While the writer declares for the latter (spiritual agency), he as distinctly declares his belief that the Spirits communicating, by no adequate proofs are shown to be the Spirits of our departed

friends; because it is admitted that they may be personated, and often are personated, by *evil* Spirits; neither is the proof adequate that they are *good angels*, because the same imposition is often detected; and the matter of their communications is manifestly too mawkish to sustain their pretensions. The whole movement, then, we accredit to a peculiar kind of angels, of whom our Savior speaks. Our reasons are as follows:

"1. Many deceptions, confessedly, are practiced, and our Spiritualists have not shown that they are able to prove those Spirits, accepted as good, to be other than deceivers."

There is nothing like demonstration attending this first reason for calling them all "bad Spirits;" because all that is assumed may be true, and yet many of the Spirits communicating be good and true angels; nay more, if good and true Spirits ever have communicated with man, they have communicated under just such circumstances, subject to just such conditions, and man has been liable to just such impositions.

To illustrate this subject, take for example the spiritual communications in the days of Jesus and the Apostles. Spiritual deceptions were practiced in those days. Numerous instances are given where men were subject to demoniacal obsessions; where dark and undeveloped Spirits exerted force and made communications. They had the reputation, also, of being able to assume false appearances, "transforming themselves into angels of light." Now, unless those teachers were able to show, by some demonstrable evidence, that those Spirits accepted as good were "other than deceivers," how are we to rely upon their testimony? because the same evidence which would require Spiritualists to demonstrate that Spirits appearing to be good and truthful were really so, would require of those early teachers the same demonstration; and those claiming for their teachings confidence and respect, must first be able to show, under such rule, that they are entitled to it. The Doctor, in laying down his rules by which to test Spiritualism, must be careful that he does not exhibit the folly of a Haman, by preparing a gallows for himself, or the madness of a Samson, by pulling the house down upon his own head.

Under such rule, by what evidence are we to know that the angel Gabriel was not a false and deceptive Spirit? The young men in shining garments at the tomb of Jesus, gave no evidence of their identity. Jesus himself, after his reappearance, only exhibited himself to his disciples, and proved his identity only by such appearances as addressed the eye or some of the senses. He convinced the eleven by showing his hands and his side; he removed the skepticism of Thomas by offering to let him handle him, and they all seemed to think that such was a sufficient identification. Paul, in arguing to the Corinthians the fact of his resurrection, did not think of referring to higher proof than that of his *appearance*; yet the learned Doctor says that such evidence is not sufficient. *He says that evil Spirits may, and often do, personate our departed friends*, and therefore we must have better evidence than mere resemblance. His argument is, if we can not show *who* the Spirit is, we can not rely upon his statement. We suppose he lays this down as a general rule.

Now for the test: When Jesus was separated from his disciples, and a cloud received him out of their sight, and there appeared two men in white apparel, telling them "that he should so come in like manner as they had seen him go into heaven," did they know who these men were? By what test did they determine that these were not lying Spirits? and what external evidence can the Doctor offer to the contrary? We have only their word, and we do not know who they were. The event has not yet taken place, and the promise was made eighteen hundred years ago; and, according to the opinions of those professing to be learned in these things, the time has more than once gone by when he should have returned.

It can not be denied that if the state of things between this and the Spirit-world be such as to justify the establishment of such test rules as the Doctor lays down, he must walk up to the test himself, when he attempts to assert what has and what has not come from good and true Spirits. He has no right to demand of Spirits in modern times that they furnish evidence of identity before they are entitled to credit, and yet claim that such evidence ought not to be demanded of those who manifested themselves in ancient times.

The Doctor's second reason for concluding that the Spirits making these manifestations are all of them false, is as follows:

"2. This theory abundantly accounts for all the *facts* in the case, and the contrary can not be shown; whereas all others signally failed."

The theory which the Doctor says accounts for all the facts, is this: That there is a class of bad angels or Spirits who have the power to make all these various manifestations; to read our thoughts, personate our friends, "transform themselves into angels of light," speak with unknown tongues, heal diseases, etc.; so that when we, like Thomas, become satisfied of the identity of our departed friends, because they appear in form, feature and voice, and give characteristic tests, the Doctor says that is not sufficient, because his hypothetic angels can counterfeit all that, so successfully, that man can not detect the imposition. When they furnish every outward evidence of being good and pure by the doctrines they teach, by the appearance they assume, the Doctor says this is no more than the bad angels can do. Well may the Doctor assume, according to his second point, that his theory "accounts for all the *facts* in the case;" for it not only accounts for all the facts in the case of *modern* manifestations, but it also accounts for all the facts in *ancient* manifestations beside. There is not a single case of spiritual manifestation in the Bible, which, according to such test, may not be referred to these bad angels. Give to them the power and disposition the Doctor says they possess, and there is no appearance however bright, there is no representation however exact, there is no doctrine however true, that they may not assume, represent and teach, and there is an end of all certainty that there are any but false Spirits. The Doctor may select any example of spiritual manifestation he pleases, from the Old or New Testament, and apply his first and second tests, and he will find that his tests must give way, or his facts will fail him.

But again the Doctor continues, *idem*:

"3. The absence of dignified discourse, of respectable originality of combination in the most common ideas, the contradictory and often absurd nature of the things communicated, and

their tendency to *confuse and confound the operations of the mind*, are precisely such a result as might be expected from an evil agency."

If by the expression, "the absence of dignified discourse," etc., the Doctor means to say that the communicating Spirits never give lofty and dignified communications, he asserts that which is not true, and which he can not maintain; for there are communications in poetry and prose, upon moral, philosophic, scientific and religious subjects, equaling anything yet appearing in human language. If he only means to say that a *portion* of them are of a trifling character, then his argument amounts to nothing; for if the communicating Spirits are the true and legitimate sons and daughters of earth, only an inconsiderable portion of them *could* give lofty and dignified communications, unless they had made very great and rapid improvement since entering the Spirit spheres. If our Doctor, even, were in the Spirit world, and should send back such an argument as is contained in his "THREEFOLD TEST," no reasonable mind would think he had achieved much as a logician. If the Doctor would reflect, he would see that the mass of communications from the world of Spirits are, at least, as elevated, moral and philosophical as are the mass of minds entering that world; that their philosophy and theology are as rational and consistent as the philosophy and theology of the mass in the form.

We are much in the habit of over-estimating the intelligence of the priest and people on spiritual and religious subjects; and if this is doubted the demonstration is easily made. It would be a curious and interesting experiment for one to make, should he attempt to ascertain the various opinions of the people and clergy upon any one department of truth belonging to the world of Spirits. Let him take his paper and pencil and go forth, and ask the first man he meets his ideas respecting the Spirit-world; his ideas of heaven and hell; of rewards and punishments; of God and the devil; of angels and Spirits; of "paradise" and the "third heaven;" of the resurrection and the judgment, etc., and he would not have occasion to go far among the clergy even, before the amount of absurdity and contradiction on each of those points would lead him to conclude, according to the Doc-

tor's logic, that he had been consulting *evil*, or at least *undeveloped Spirits*.

Again, the Doctor argues the evil and false character of these Spirits, because,

"4. The denial of the grand leading doctrine of atonement for sin by the merits of Christ, upon which the Bible suspends human salvation, is the very thing that, of all others, we might expect from satanic agency; and this denial is persistently maintained by those accepted as *good Spirits*."

If by the "denying the grand leading doctrine of atonement for sin by the merits of Christ," the Doctor means the old dogma of a vicarious sacrifice for sin—that Jesus died to satisfy the demands of divine justice, and make man's salvation possible—that *innocence* suffered to *atone* for *guilt*—we affirm that not only all good and sensible Spirits out of the body, but also all rational and sensible minds in the body, deny "persistently" such an abominable doctrine; and we further affirm that neither Jesus nor the apostles ever taught any such doctrine; nor can it anywhere be found in the Bible. And we say further, that the principles involved in such a doctrine are inconsistent with every sound principle of justice and morality known to man, and, according to man's highest and best standard of judgment, derogatory to the divine character. But if, by the "grand leading doctrine of atonement for sin by the merits of Christ," the Doctor means the necessity of having our lives and characters brought into a state of harmony and oneness with God by being christened or appointed by the divine Spirit; by being baptized into, and consequently by putting on, the divine life, by having the same foundation for salvation laid in us as was laid in Jesus, then indeed do the Spirits teach the "grand leading doctrine of atonement;" then indeed do they teach that there is no other way under heaven among men by which salvation can come. If the Doctor adheres to the old orthodox dogma of a vicarious atonement, and sets that up as being worthy of respect, and by that heathenish standard tries the Spirits, then indeed "are they honored in his condemnation."

The fifth reason why the Doctor thinks these manifestations

are from evil Spirits, is of so vague and indefinite a character as to admit of no reply. "We are told," he says, "to put on the whole armor of God, that we may be able to stand against the wiles of the DEVIL;" "to be aware lest we fall into the condemnation of the DEVIL," "lest we fall into the snare of the DEVIL," etc., all of which amounts to nothing toward proving the good or bad character of the Spirits communicating. He intimates that the Spirits are all trying to bring the Bible into disrepute, etc. This is not true. A very large proportion speak in terms of respect of the doctrines of the Bible; and while they deny the truthfulness of certain false dogmas which sectarians glean from the Bible, they assert that the Bible teaches instead great spiritual truths.

Many, very many affirm that the Bible is a spiritual book of the deepest significance; and while they deny that man can learn from its letter the spiritual significance of its language without the inspiration of the Spirit, and that consequently the Bible, without the attendant inspiration of the Spirit, is not, in form, the Word of God, they deny, on the one hand, and affirm on the other, nothing but what Jesus likewise denied and affirmed; and if they are to be denounced as evil because they hold to such doctrines, they are to be denounced for speaking the truth as Jesus himself taught it. The Spirits no more seek to bring the Bible into disrepute, in its *internal* and *spiritual* sense, than does the Doctor himself; but they do seek to bring into disrepute that bigoted deference and servility manifested by those who bow before the *image* without perceiving the *spirit* thereof—who worship the *form* in the shape of a book, irrespective of the significance of that which the *form* typifies.

This veneration for the Bible as a mere book, taught and practiced by the bigoted and sectarian, is mere "cant," and is the means of circulating more falsehood than truth. When they teach men that the mere words and sentences of that or any other book constitute the Word of God, those receiving such instruction, and believing in it, will form their own ideas of the meaning of those words and sentences, and will suppose that such false meanings of their own are to be imputed to God, and they will make *them* standards by which to judge of *other truths*;

and in this way, by their own false standards, will they reject the truth, and suppose they are acting upon the authority of God; and thus will charge God with their folly. This is the inevitable consequence of attempting to receive any truth upon mere authority, and this false and pernicious practice all wise and good Spirits must certainly condemn.

This position is not merely theoretical; it is practically true. Take the thousand and one sects which have based their faith upon the authoritative teachings of the Bible, and nine-tenths of all they have taught as coming therefrom is false, and no one can doubt that under the teachings of the Greek, Catholic and Protestant churches, among the Christians and the Scribes, Pharisees and Sadducees, and among the Jews, there is vastly more falsehood taught and believed as coming from the Bible than there is truth; so that practically, under the authoritative system of teaching the Bible, it is a greater instrument of falsehood than of the truth, and consequently is one of the greatest impediments in the way of the reception of truth.

The Doctor's sixth reason for believing the Spirits to be *evil* is, that they deny the existence of the "Devil and his angels," according to the interpretation of Orthodoxy. Now, before the Doctor can make anything out of this last point, it will be incumbent on him to prove their denial to be false. If the Doctor affirms there is an "ORTHODOX DEVIL," he should furnish some proof before his affirmation be taken as true. I am prepared to affirm that the Doctor can not prove the existence of a personal Devil either from nature or revelation; that there is nothing in the wide universe known to man, which indicates the existence of any such being; that such a being can not be introduced into the divine government without impeaching the character and attributes of Deity; that the Orthodox Devil is a blasphemous absurdity, one of the remaining false deities of heathenism that true enlightenment is destined to destroy.

HOW THE MIND ACTS.

WHEN I WILL to raise my arm, there is a power instantaneously communicated by which my arm obeys the mandate, and when I WILL to suspend that power, my arm falls to my side again. The origin of that power is in my WILL, which is a faculty of my mind or spirit. Independent of that WILL, my arm possesses no power to move itself. Or if that medium of connection between my arm and mind be interrupted, by severing the nerves of motion which communicate with my arm, my will has no more power over my own arm than it has over yours; yet, nevertheless, that arm can still be made to move by the specific application of the magnetic fluid to the motor nerve. The muscle can thus be made to expand and contract, and the same or similar motion can be given to the arm, as though it were directly connected with my spirit will.

The direct agency exerted upon the muscle in either case, is that of the electric or magnetic fluid causing the expansion and contraction thereof. The difference between the two methods of moving the arm, consists in this: the electric or magnetic fluid is excited by the WILL in the one case, and by means of a common electric, magnetic, or galvanic battery in the other. There is also another difference growing out of the first: the excitation of the magnetic force, in the former case being under the direct SPIRIT WILL, is more wisely and systematically directed in its action along the motor nerves and upon the muscles, than when under the mechanical action of a senseless battery. There is not a particle of matter composing the voluntary muscles which does not connect with the brain, which is the great battery of the will, and under the entire management of the mind or spirit. When the mind wishes to move a muscle to any degree, it communicates along these nerves (the nerves of motion) the exact quan-

ity of magnetic force necessary to communicate the desired motion ; and it can increase or diminish the quantity, as it desires to increase or diminish the intensity of muscular action.

But when this electric or magnetic influence is excited by the spirit will, it must act through the intervening media of the *nervous* and *vital* fluid. It will be remembered that in a previous article I traced the manifestation of these different media, from electricity, magnetism, etc., through *vitality* and the *nervous* medium up to mind or spirit, and pointed out these peculiarities as exhibited by nature in all her operations. Thus the electric and magnetic media were manifested in the mineral kingdom before the principle of vitality made its appearance ; and hence the principles of electricity and magnetism, in their modes of manifestation, were independent of vitality. Not so with vitality ; being developed or manifested after those media, it was dependent upon them for its material manifestation, and is never manifested in nature without their presence. So also with the nervous medium. Vitality was developed in the vegetable kingdom before sensation was manifested ; and hence, in its material manifestation, it was independent of the nervous medium. Not so with the nervous medium, being developed after vitality ; it was dependent upon it for its material manifestation, and is never manifested in nature without its presence ; and the same thing also may be said in reference to the nervous medium and spirit.

Now whenever the mind seeks to act upon matter, it must act through the agency of these intervening media. Hence when the mind seeks to expand or contract the material muscle, it must be connected with that muscle by all these intervening media of *nervous* *vital* and *magnetic* fluids. If either of these links in the connecting chain are wanting, the mind can not act upon the muscle. Hence if the motor nerve be severed, or if vitality have abandoned that part of the system—the mind can not move the arm, any more than any other lifeless clod. Upon the same principle, if vitality be wanting in any part of the system, sensation can not be manifested in that part ; for the same reason there can be no sensation in a dead subject. Nature is uniform in her teachings on these points.

In strict harmony with the foregoing principles, if I wish to

contract or expand the muscle by the agency of the electric or magnetic batteries, I can do so without the presence of either vitality or the nervous medium. Hence take the dead subject, before the muscles become rigid or inflexible, and by the application of the proper electric or magnetic currents along the nerves of motion, muscular action will be induced. The plain and obvious reason for this is, electricity or magnetism can manifest their power over matter, without the presence of any of the higher media, and being excited by the material battery, and not by the mind, the presence of the higher media is unnecessary.

Thus it will be perceived, as has before been observed, that electricity, etc., connects directly with gross matter, and that all the higher must act through this agency when they would affect matter. And the similarity of the muscular motion, whether produced by the direct act of human volition or by the magnetic battery, illustrates the truth of the position. The muscular motion is to be produced by the expansion and contraction of the muscle; and the muscle is to be expanded and contracted by the communication of a magnetic current along and through the same; and now it matters not so far as producing motion is concerned, whether the magnetic current be excited by the spiritual *will* or by a common battery. In either case, the motion is produced by the direct agency of magnetism or electricity.

PHILOSOPHY OF MUSCULAR ACTION.

It may not be out of place here, to throw out a suggestion as to the philosophy of muscular contraction, etc., through the agency of electricity and magnetism, as it may tend to elucidate still further this subject. That suggestion is this: the muscles, in their mechanical structure, if I may use the expression, are a combination of electro magnets, and become charged through the agency of these wires (the nerves of motion), connecting them directly with the brain, which is the great battery of the mind, and these magnets are so arranged as to become armatures to other magnets, and when charged they are strongly attracted or drawn together, so as to produce muscular contraction. Take the suggestion for what it is worth, and examine it at your lei-

sure. But whether the above suggestion be true or false, I can not stop to discuss it now. It is enough for present purposes to know that such contractions and expansions are the result of electric and magnetic action upon the muscle, and the WILL possesses power to excite and suspend that action. These are the important facts to be noticed and remembered; and if we can not satisfactorily ascertain *how* it does it, we must not on that account reject the fact. We may not be able to understand how the sun attracts the earth, or the magnet the needle, nevertheless the fact can not be denied.

PHILOSOPHY OF ULTIMATES.

The philosophy of the ultimate relation existing between cause and effect, finite mind can not comprehend. It may trace intermediate links in the great chain of causation, but the ultimate **WHY** it can never fathom. We can say that the earth is caused to move in its orbit about the sun by the attractive influence of the sun upon it. But why the sun attracts the earth at all, is a question lying deeper still, and should that question be solved, there would be found another **WHY** still underlying that. With this limitation, then, I state, from positions taken, and principles illustrated in previous articles, it is not difficult to explain how spirit controls the electric and magnetic media.

In previous articles I have had occasion to notice the successive developments of electricity, magnetism, vitality, sensation and spirit, and the relation they each sustained to the other. I called your attention to the fact, that nature in her grand laboratory always observed this order, and in their manifestations they were never inverted; that is, that electricity always joined upon matter, vitality upon electricity, etc., the nervous medium upon vitality, and mind upon the nervous medium. In the operations of nature, we have always observed that each of these media are positive to all below, and negative to all above; that is, that matter is negative and passive to electricity, etc., that to vitality, that to the nervous medium, and that to the spirit; so that in the ascending scale we always pass from a negative to a positive, and in the descending scale we pass from positive to the negative.

THE POSITION OF THE AGES.

SOCIETY has advanced into the first half of the intellectual age, when the selfish and brutal are beginning to give way. But as in the individual, the development of the intellectual does not necessarily destroy the animal, but only refines or puts away the grosser features of it, so in society the advance to the intellectual age still retains much of the animal selfishness and force. Only the grosser and more brutal forms are laid aside, while the selfish and lustful Devil yet presides in more polite, gentlemanly and fashionable bosoms. The advance is rather from shameless animalism to gentlemanly hypocrisy, exhibiting an enlightened head, but an unconverted heart.

The first advance in the intellectual age is little less selfish and brutal than the highest point in the animal age, as the lowest intellect in man is but little removed from the highest sphere of animal mind. As the intellectual is developed through the physical in man, that is, as the intellectual deduces its principles from the phenomena of the first sphere, and consequently bases its action in the earlier stage of its development upon the physical, so the first development of the intellectual age in society bases its first action upon the selfish and force principles of the animal age; and it is only as the intellectual age develops with its principles, that the animal age will recede and ultimately disappear. When this second age of society shall be so far advanced as to perceive correctly the true nature and relation of things, without going back to the precedents of the past for instruction and authority for present action, then the animalisms of the past will quickly disappear, and society will advance rapidly in the principles of wisdom and charity, and the golden age will soon dawn upon the world. In the light of true philosophy, nothing can be more absurd and ridiculous than for the present age of society to go back to the

darker ages to obtain light and life in civil, social and religious matter, as revealed in their ancient opinions and institutions. It would be as wise for the chemist to go back to the old alchemists to find out the true law of chemical equivalents, or the geologists to go back to the days of legendary cosmogony to ascertain the true geological character of the earth, as for our civilians to go back to the year books to find out the principles of justice and human rights, or for our religious and moral teachers to go back to the days of animal darkness to find out the true character of God, and of our relations to him. There are few men in this age of the world, in any enlightened country, who do not know as much of the true character of God and the nature of true religion as did Noah or Lot, Abraham, Isaac or Jacob, as did Moses or Aaron, Samuel or David.

And again, the idea that the institutions of early days can impose any obligation upon the present age, are more than absurd, when viewed in the true light of the sovereignty of man. Man's sovereignty in this sphere of existence, only continues while he occupies this sphere. When he goes hence, he takes everything appertaining to his individuality with him, and leaves no authority to control those who come after him. That upon which his individual sovereignty and rights was based, is gone; the reason for their exercise here has ceased, and consequently their exercise should cease.

But it is a law of nature that society should, in its transition state from one era to another, receive its light and life from that which immediately precedes the one upon which it is entering, because in the mere dawn of the new era, it has not the full light of that era, and must depend upon the light of the past until it comes into that of the future. But in the progress of its advancement it is destined to come into the new light, and therefore should turn its face to the future that it may perceive the light.

The first half of the succeeding age will be occupied in changing the forms of old institutions, suited to the new spirit which is to be infused into them, and the nineteenth century is destined to do that work. The despotic forms of government will give place to the republican. The arbitrary and authoritative forms

of religious institutions will cease, and a religious life will consist more in doing the will of God than in believing in it. No importance will be attached to creeds and confessions of faith, which now occupy so much the attention of the religious world.

The vanguard of society, in its progressive movement, is now reaching that portion of the intellectual age when the form is being mistaken for the substance. This will become apparent when we analyze the institutions of the present age, and ascertain the principles involved in them. The civil institutions which in form are the outbirth of the present age, are designed to represent the great idea of the universality and inalienability of human rights. There is a perception of this truth in society, without a realization of it; that is, society feel that it is true, and yet lack wisdom to realize it. They endeavor to realize the idea, by changing the *form* of the institution; but here, again, they mistake. The mischief of past institutions has not consisted so much in their *form*, as in their *spirit*.

Institutions derive their *form* from the intelligence, and their *spirit* from the love of society. The head may perceive a truth before the heart will embrace it, and thus the form of justice may precede the spirit of it. And thus it is in respect to the progressive development of civil institutions in the intellectual age. The form of liberty and justice precedes the spirit of it; that is, the head becomes enlightened before the heart becomes converted; and society resolve to pursue a more moral course, before they conclude to adopt the principle.

The doctrine of the universality and inalienability of human rights, is a high spiritual truth which is destined to be better understood and appreciated during the latter portion of the age of intellect. As yet, the idea in society, that all men are created equal and are endowed with certain inalienable rights, is a vague, undefined idea. Some minds, very highly enlightened on certain subjects, can not clearly perceive the idea as a truth, and are disposed to treat it as a chimera—a mere “rhetorical flourish.” And men often talk loudly of their rights without understanding very definitely what those rights are. They not unfrequently claim rights which are not theirs, and part with those which are.

Society will never advance very far in the age of understand-

ing, until the individuality, sovereignty and equality of man is understood; and, until they are understood, there will be constant conflict and antagonism between parts of the same institution and between different institutions. All truths, viewed in their proper relations, harmonize, while falsehood conflicts with the system of universal truth. The civil institutions of society will never be free from antagonism so long as any false principles are admitted into them.

As civil institutions are the creations of men and, in the wisdom age, will be designed to be suited to the character and wants of man, it is of the first importance that the sphere of individual sovereignty and rights should be understood.

Every human being is an individual, subject to certain physical, social and spiritual necessities, which give rise to certain incidents appurtenant to such being, called rights. And as all physical, social and moral necessities in man, are naturally the same, their natural rights are equal. No man can assume the being of another, nor can he change his being with or for another. His own individuality and its appurtenances are all that he can possess or properly control. He has received his being for himself, and has become an immortal conscious entity, and must forever bear and suffer in himself the fruit of his own activity.

Being independent in his individuality, being exclusively his own in all he is or must hereafter be, being obliged to take upon himself the responsibilities of being, he is and must be peculiarly his own master, sovereign within his own sphere, and responsible to no one but himself and the supreme and Divine Being who gave him his existence and established that government under which he must forever continue. Hence the conclusion is inevitable, that all men possess the same natural rights as appurtenances to their existence, and that they can not justly be deprived of them until they shall cease to exist. That Power only which can extinguish their existence has any authority to extinguish their rights, and when their being shall be extinguished, then, and not till then, will their rights cease.

These rights being appurtenant to man's existence, must necessarily be inalienable. Until he can so change the government which gave and continues his being, as to dispense with his

necessities, he can not dispose of his rights, and as no other being can assume his individuality, he can not rightfully be deprived of them.

In respect to those rights which are based upon the natural necessities of man, all are equal. No man or number of men can claim any pre-eminence or rightfully exercise any. Within the sphere of man's natural rights, then, he is sovereign, and while acting within that sphere he is amenable to no human authority. He possesses within himself all the rights incident to humanity. The whole world can claim no more—he can accept of no less. There is no accumulation of natural rights in society rising above the natural rights of the individual. There are no natural rights which do not appertain to man as an individual, and those rights can not be separated from him. He may be deprived of the power to exercise them, but nevertheless they are his and belong not to another. Government can not create rights any more than they can create worlds. They have a higher paternity than human legislation. Human governments may grant license to individuals to do certain things which do not interfere with natural rights; but if they do thus interfere the license is unauthorized, and the individual takes nothing by the governmental grant.

All the inhabitants of the world united have no more authority over the natural rights of the individual than has a single person. Rights are based upon higher authority than numbers. A million ciphers added together amount to nothing. If A, as an individual being, has no authority to interfere with my personal sovereignty or to deprive me of my natural rights, and if B, C and D, and so on to the sum of all mankind, have individually no such authority, add them all together and how much authority do they possess, individually possessing none? The sum of their authority would be expressed by the value of so many ciphers.

Out of man's individuality arises his sovereignty. As all naturally possess the same rights, all are equally sovereign, and one man can not acquire authority over another within the sphere of that sovereignty. Hence every man's sovereignty is limited only by the equal sovereignty of others, and his natural rights are only equal to the natural rights of others.

These natural rights which appertain to every human being as a portion of his birthright, are—

1. A right to the free use of everything which nature has provided for man without his care or labor, to be so used as not to interfere with the same right in his equal brother. This right extends to the earth, with its seas and fountains, its natural fruits and other productions—to the natural heavens, with its sunlight, its atmosphere, its rains and its dews.

2. A right to enjoy the free and unrestricted exercise of his being and all the faculties thereof, in such a manner as not to interfere with the same exercise in every other human being. This includes his right to his life and his liberty, whereby he may adapt his being to those circumstances by which he is surrounded, and call them to his aid in developing and unfolding his physical, intellectual and celestial being.

3. He has a right to the possession and enjoyment of the fruit of his own physical and spiritual labors—to keep or dispose of them as he shall see fit, ever keeping within the rule that his rights are to be so used as not to interfere with the same rights in others; and these, thus exercised, make up the natural and inalienable rights of man. And civil institutions are false to the best interests of society when they attempt, in any manner, to destroy any or all of these natural rights. The trinity to be revered and obeyed by social and civil institutions, should be the individuality, sovereignty and equality of all men. Under no circumstances should they be violated by governmental sanction; and governments keeping within those landmarks can not fail to be true to the necessity which calls for their existence; and it is to the attainment of this end that society will advance during the last period of the intellectual age.

In the animal age of society the rights of man were neither respected nor known; neither the individuality, sovereignty nor equality of man was preserved, but on the contrary was purposely violated. Life, liberty and property were subject to the will of the ruling power, and nothing but physical force could stay the execution of that will. Dominion was usually acquired by conquest, and governments were established by, and became the property of, the conqueror. The conquered became his vassals,

and they held all their rights subject to the will of the despot, as between subject and subject rights were sometimes observed and enforced; but not between subject and sovereign. These despotic governments of the age of animalism claimed for themselves absolute sovereignty and despotic power, and exercised themselves accordingly; and thus these governments became merely instruments of force and oppression.

But as society advances in knowledge the forms of government are changing for the better, and they will continue improving until the rights of all men under them will be distinctly recognized and respected. But hitherto all human governments have exhibited a reckless disregard of the rights of the individual. Whatever may have been their theory they have never failed to plant the iron heel upon the neck of their disfranchised subjects. There never has been a human government which has not wilfully and purposely crushed the individual and placed its authority above the rights of man.

The character of American republicanism demonstrates, that although society has advanced in the *form* of its civil institutions from the despotism of the animal age to the *form* of freedom, still it is under the spirit of the age of animalism. The head has become enlightened, but the heart is not yet converted. Thus, while the inalienability of the rights of man is acknowledged, animal selfishness will not admit of its practice, and so long as this selfishness prevails, community will be subject to the injustice and force of the animal age.

That portion of society exempted from the forcible oppressions of animalism, like the free laborer, is still the subject of unjust governmental action. The grosser form of oppression under the lash of the taskmaster, is succeeded by that of fraud under the tricks and devices of the commercial system. The ignorant consent of the victim is obtained, and the plunder is committed peaceably. The master which now tasks the laborer and reaps the reward of his toil, is capital. Under the commercial system of enlightened governments, the laborer is as much in bondage as under the feudal system of the animal age. This will fully appear as we proceed.

We have already shown that man is entitled to the fruit of his

own labor; that it is an object of his own creation, and can not of right belong to another, unless it is freely transferred by the rightful owner; that all men are alike possessed of this right, and, in this respect, are possessed of equal rights. This equal right of all to the fruit of their own labor, is one of the self-evident truths, and lays the foundation for considering man's right to property.

Justice between man and man consists in rendering unto every one that which is his. This constitutes equality of right, and this equality of right constitutes equality of relation. Whenever this equality of relation is disturbed, whether by individuals or communities, injustice is done. When it is done ignorantly, then the victim alone must suffer; but when it is done designedly, the subject as well as object of unjust action, become sufferers.

A crime consists in a willful invasion of right. The criminality of the invader consists in his disregard of the demands of justice—in his contempt for the authority of right, and exhibits him as under the law of selfishness and force. The thief is a wrong-doer in this—he disturbs the equality of relation between himself and his fellow-man, by availing himself of the property of another without his consent, and without rendering an equivalent for it. The swindler differs from the thief in this—he fraudulently obtains the consent of the owner by false inducements or lying representations. The robber differs from the swindler and thief, in the exercise of force to obtain what he takes. But they are all alike in this—they seek to obtain the property of others without rendering equivalents for the same; they seek to be unjust in their relations. The thief obtains his advantage by stealth, the swindler obtains his by fraud, and the robber his by force. The difference is in the *manner* of doing the wrong, and not in the *matter* of the wrong itself.

Whoever seeks to avail himself of the property of another without rendering for it an equivalent, belongs to one of these three classes of minds, and he avails himself of stealth, fraud or force. Thus the counterfeiter is guilty of fraud; the monopolist takes advantage of necessity, which is another name for force; the speculator sometimes of fraud, sometimes of force, and some-

times of both; the capitalist is constantly endeavoring to take advantage of the times—that is, of the necessities of those about him. All are striving to make money or property—not to earn it, which being interpreted means, all are striving to avail themselves of the labor and property of others without returning its equal value.

So constant is this condition of mind and so common the practice, that it is seldom thought of as being unjust and false; and the fruits of such activity, which are most apparent on every hand, are seldom attributed to their real cause. All real property is the product of labor, and justly belongs to him whose labor has produced it. But it is not found there; on the contrary, it is found in the hands of those who are not engaged in productive labor; and those who possess the most are usually those who have labored the least, and those who possess the least are usually those who have been most the slaves of hard labor. Here, then, is a curious problem to solve: How is it that such results are accomplished? One man labors and another man reaps the reward. The answer is easy and simple. Labor, in this age of enlightenment, is the slave of capital. In the advance of society it has changed masters. Under the animal dispensation it was the slave of physical power; now it is the slave of commercial power, or money. The former master possessed himself of his vassals' earnings by force; the present master obtains possession by fraud. Mammon has dethroned Moloch, that is the difference. Under the former administration dominion was obtained by physical power—now it is obtained by money; and the great impulse to worldly activity in this age of enlightenment, is to obtain money, the love of which is the root of evil in this dispensation.

This love of money is the ruling impulse in every profession and calling in this noon of the nineteenth century. The priest, the doctor, the lawyer, the author, the artist, the mechanic, the farmer, are in hot pursuit after wealth. They are choosing the golden baulle. There are certain beaten paths in which they may move, and be honored and respected, although they are as unjust as the thief, the swindler, the robber, and counterfeiter, in obtaining the labor and property of others without returning equivalents. The poor

laborer is the only sheep, and there are many shearers each striving for the clip; and while the laborer is bent down under his toil, these shearers have only to select the place for cutting off the finest wool.

Trade and commerce are the pets of all civilized governments, and they claim to be doing God and man essential service while they foster and protect them. But what is trade, and what are its maxims? It is an art by which one class live and flourish out of the unpaid sweat and toil of another. The wealth accumulated by trade is composed of the wool and hide of the unpaid laborer. Trade is based upon unjust relations between producer and consumer, and all its labor and influence are directed to establish and keep up those unjust relations; and the greater the injustice, that is, the wider the difference between the thing received, and that which is given in return, the more attractive and honorable it is.

The maxims of trade are corrupt and corrupting in their influence. The "caveat emptor" is a great engine of fraud. "A thing is worth what it will bring in market," being interpreted means, *a man's necessities make him a lawful subject of robbery*. "Buy at the bottom, and sell at the top of the market," means *gouge at both ends of the trade*. Thus it is the business of trade to steal, and of commerce to carry away the plunder; and this is civilization before it has arrived at the meridian of the intellectual age. The whole system of trade is dishonest and unjust in spirit, whatever may be its form. The difference between the common trader, the gambler, counterfeiter, swindler, thief and robber, consists mainly in the mere form which they pursue to obtain the same end, and achieve the same result; that is, they all seek that which in justice belongs to another, without rendering a full equivalent. The first form of plundering, the law protects and encourages; the latter form it condemns and punishes.

But in this there is an advance in the condition of society. The mass are becoming enlightened; trade and commerce can not flourish without producing enlightenment. It awakens an energy and activity in the mind which causes it to explore all the departments of nature, and vast resources of knowledge are laid open. Science and art are developed, and free thought, the foe of oppression, takes wing, and can not be bound. Men can only be made

slaves by being kept in ignorance. Trade and commerce will dissipate that ignorance, and men will become too enlightened to become slaves. This enlightenment is already doing away with the grosser forms of oppression ; and by continuing to progress, it will do away with the spirit of it. Men must first become convicted by enlightenment, before they can become convicted by repentance. Society is now in the process of being convicted, and conversion will ultimately follow.

Human governments will become more simple and copy more from nature. Hitherto their machinery has been too complex, unwieldy and expensive ; they have taken too wide a range. They have not unfrequently assumed the rights and duties of the individual, and thus come into conflict with the rights of man, and placed one portion of community upon the necks of an other portion. The world has been governed too much. The sphere of human government is protection merely, and that protection is only demanded in cases of forcible or fraudulent invasion of rights.

Were men not disposed to trespass upon the rights of others by taking advantage of their weakness or ignorance, they would stand in little need of human governments. Or had every individual the wisdom and power to protect himself from fraud and force, they would have no occasion to call on governments for aid. Hence it will be perceived that the only true sphere of human government, is to protect the individual in the enjoyment of his natural rights—to stand between the cunning and the ignorant, between the strong and the weak ; and when it does that, it does all it need do ; it does all that human government properly can. If it go beyond this, it interferes with individual sovereignty, and disturbs the just relations between man, and becomes the source of those very evils it is its office to prevent.

All this will eventually be understood, and all laws interfering with the civil and social relations of life will be repealed, and the entire civil department of government will be dispensed with. Trade will be conducted upon equitable principles, and credit will be based upon integrity of character, instead of pecuniary responsibility. Then, indeed, will "honesty be the best policy," and the

only policy which individuals can adopt to obtain confidence ; and establish credit.

Thus it will be perceived that society is in the first half of the intellectual age, which incorporates into it much of the selfishness and force of the preceding one. The ruling impulse is from the animal. Its greatest care is yet to gratify, feed and develop the physical, to the neglect of the intellectual and moral ; Mammon is worshiped instead of Moloch, because her ways are more peaceable, and at the same time her paths lead to the temple of fame and honor. "Self love and social" are becoming the same, which will eventually extend to the individual, and then self will be united with charity, and the ruling impulse of the animal era will disappear.

SIMPLICITY.

SIMPLICITY is the invariable characteristic of truth. Error loves to hide her deformity in cumbrous shapes and complicated envelopments ; to bury her sophistries in mazy labyrinths of subtlety, and disguise her purposes in oracular ambiguities. But truth is open as the day ; her aspect is radiant with candor, her language direct and plain ; her precepts admirable in beauty, irresistible in force. The great elementary principles of whatever is most valuable to man are distinguished by simplicity. If we follow nature to her hiding-places, and wring from her that secret by which she conducts her stupendous operations, we shall find that a few simple truths constitute the foundation of all her vast designs. If we roam abroad into the fields of science, the same discovery will reward our investigations. Behold, for example, on what a few self-evident axioms is reared that sublime and irrefragable system of mathematical reasoning, by means of which man proportions the grandest forms of art, directs his course through the pathless wastes of ocean, or, ascending into the boundless fields of space, tracks the comet in its fiery path, and "unwinds the eternal dances of the sky."

ABSTRACT TRUTHS AND OBJECTIVE REALITIES.

BY LOVE M. WHITCOMB.

We find that the human family, at present, perfectly agree only upon what is revealed through the external senses. Science is demonstrative; and whatever science reveals becomes fact, because it is recognizable through experiment and by observation. Mathematical truths are thus demonstrable. Most children have no perception of the fact that two and two make four, until you place before them the numbers in form to be perceived by the eye. Give them two balls, and add two more, and the fact is then a revelation; before it was an assumption, from their reliance on your word and faith in your knowledge. The child has then established a law. If two times two make four, he can believe that two times forty make eighty, though you place not the numbers in balls before him. He has demonstrated the truth of the rule by observation, and trusts it as invariable beyond the limit of observation.

The mathematician knows that a million times a million will make a trillion, because of the unity of mathematical law, though he could not count the number in centuries. Then on what is he dependent for his knowledge? Merely on a *law*. The fact that a thousand times a thousand make a million, must, then, be an abstract truth to him; for the figures that represent the numbers are of no significance except as signs, and they *express* the law, but he is dependent upon the *law* for the certainty. We find thus, that it is only necessary to establish a law through the external, and it will reveal with mathematical certainty what observation can not embrace. We trust the higher mathematical truths only through our trust of law. We *know* through our reliance on law; for if by any possibility the law could vary, then our trust would be lost.

The science of mathematics is as all other sciences. The geologist tells of the foundation of worlds, of stratification and formation, because he has found by observation the effect of cause. It is as easy for him to understand what were the primitive foundations, as what rocks lie along the roadside; but that knowledge is dependent upon a law and not upon observation, and the reason accepts the knowledge through its trust in the unity of development through the unity of law.

It is certain, then, that measure and limit are dependent in their revelation, first to observation, which establishes a law, and then to faith in that law for revelation beyond possible observation. Hence we find all men recognizing that which observation clearly reveals; and when one, through his higher perceptions, reveals the law, then it must be received by another through *his* perceptions, and his reason will then act as the revelator of other expressions of the law. *Fact* is dependent upon *observation*, *law* upon *perception*; and *higher expressions of law*, unrevealed by observation, upon *the reason*; for, though a child may calculate numbers *ad infinitum*, it is only through an external law. The higher perception has not revealed the law unto him. It is by observation that he still performs, for written numbers are received as external signs, and his calculations are through them; but as he advances, his perceptions recognize the law, and he reasons to solve his problems; but whether he perceives or not, the law is sufficient for his trust.

But the man of science must perceive the law before he will establish from fact his deductions. For this perception he is not dependent upon his reason; but for the revelation of facts not recognized by observation, he is thus dependent. He denominates all fact that is thus deducible. *Thus fact has become the certainty of law*, and not merely the certainty of observation.

We only ask this course in the reception of *all* facts revealed to the observation, and we shall readily find that those higher manifestations of law relating to the mind, now denominated abstract, are as objective as the higher calculations of mathematics. Mental science is as possible as mathematical, but only through observation, perception and the reason. Men do not thus demonstrate moral and theologic truths, because they depend upon a

fact—not as the revelation of a law, but only of power. Thus God is, to them, the doer and maker of evil, and all results are by his power.

Let us consider the development of mind known as the moral. We hear of moral philosophy and moral science, but they are studied as an abstract philosophy and science, rather than as demonstrable from fact. Moral obligation is talked of, and moral virtues are inculcated; but where is the law that establishes the claim of virtue or the obligation of duty? Written moral laws are what written mathematical laws are; it is only the perception that can establish the law, and the intellect that can deduce therefrom. But mathematical law was established through simplest manifestation as through higher; all after revelation established the first, and none could contradict it. A moral truth is demonstrable, but not through a law that contradicts any other law.

The moral duty of love to all men is revealed through the perceptions; but the present state of society and the condition of individuals contradicts the recognition of the law except as an external one. The general belief is not of the law or its revelation, but is a belief in another's recognition of the law; the inculcation of the law is, popularly, only an exhortation to a selfish means of gaining peace of mind. Now the love of mankind lies in the relation of each to all, and all to each. Its science is in attraction and repulsion, which is the result of other attractions. To love is to live, and the law of love is the law of life. He loves who perceives his relations to all, and thus his duty to all. The obligation lies in the simple word *I*. What I am to another is through our unity; what I do for him I do for myself, since I am a part of what he is a part. I perceive the law of his life in my own life; I know his needs from my own needs, and I satisfy them as I would my own, from necessity. Now the common recognition of this law is as the child's recognition of the law of two and two, before he had observed the numbers in external objects, through faith in another. If you had told him that one and one make four, he would have believed you. Perception of the law is as necessary to the full practice, as perception in the solution of a problem. I perceive a law, not

through the intellect, neither by observation. One fact or one revelation of the law in myself *establishes* it, but my perceptions alone reveal it unto me. If I have felt the love for one, none can contradict its truth to me, but my intellect must reveal to me its operation. I *reason*, not feel, concerning the cause of hate in others, but my *feeling* must first have revealed the law unto me. Anything that contradicts this law of love is no law unto me, more than the written law that two and three make four is a law to the mathematician. Any such written commands must result in disorder as great as astronomical calculation through contradictory rules. I have established the law; nothing can contradict its universal expression, for whatever does so is no law.

To study morals, then, we must not study written codes, or rely upon external forms. The revelation of duty can not be through the intellect alone; the intellect recognizes the causes when the perceptions have recognized the law. Moral truths are as demonstrable, then, as mathematical, but they must be demonstrated, not by expression. As four is no law, so is expression not the law. Numbers through relation reveal their law, and in arrangement express it; my relations to my fellow-men reveal to me my moral connection with them and the law of our oneness, and therefore of the law of love. My acts are all expressions of the law of our relation. Another's acts can not contradict the law of my action; we are one in the revealment of law, and according to my perception shall I righteously judge their action.

I observe a united, happy family circle or community. Each member existing in pure relations to each other; the welfare of one is the welfare of all, and each lives in all, and all in each. I perceive, through my own attractions and love, that the law of this union is sympathy or oneness, and my intellect begins to discover the cause of relations, and I know why these all keep the commands of the Lord. I observe a family living in discord, a community at enmity. I have established a law of relations which nothing can contradict. Then is love the law of hate? Attraction creates relations; if those produce discord, then is the attraction repulsion, or the attraction of one is in one direction, of another in another. The obligation of each to all is unperceived, because there is no relation of oneness. *I* expresses,

then, *myself*, and not the universal. Yet in this disorder is there still the single law that produced order. To study society and its reform, then, one must study the law of its organization, and change its expression through the same law.

It will readily be perceived that whatever law is written, it can have an obligation only through the perception, and that perception being intuitional, there can be no contradiction through perception. Contradiction lies in external expression, and for that there is no obligation.

The abstract truth of purity is an objective reality to him who is pure; its obligation and its law are as clear to his moral nature as is the washing of his hands. A truth is abstract when it is beyond the observation, and is proved by a law that governs what observation has revealed. What is abstract becomes objective, when it is revealed in experience. A law is *established* when it is expressed; it is *perceived*, when its relations are in the mind; *other relations reveal* it when the reason makes the law universal, and all expressions to harmonize with it.

All duty must be found in the intuitions; for any reliance on a law that is not thus recognized, is as the child's trust in the rule of addition; his deductions depend upon the truth of the rule you have given him, and you are responsible for his calculations, while he is unable to perceive the truthfulness of the rule. But here we shall reason falsely, if we do not distinguish between a law as proven to be the certain one, and one *assumed* through false relations. Society has fixed limits and set bounds; it makes duty to consist in obedience to external laws; it creates an obligation and a duty, and enforces the same, whether the perception of the individual can recognize the obligation or not, and if it contradict, in its result, the unity of the individual's intuitional law. To declare that no law is binding that one's perceptions do not make so, seems like removing from individuals and society all restraint. This would be the case were law external. Law is merely the result of relations; there is no conformity to law, but law is the revelation of the *unity* of all things. Paul perfectly understood this when he declared himself free from the law, and that he had become a law unto himself. All individuals must reveal the unity of law, else we could not recognize justice

in the government of the universe. False judgments and uncharitable decisions arise wholly from this lack of perception of the governing law of others, and disagreement upon fundamental truths is also from this want of perception. All truths that lie beyond the observation, and are considered as abstract, are thus subject to misconception, because the reason has accepted false premissa.

Theology opens as wide a field for controversy as morality, from the lack of an internal perception, through the intuitions, of the truth. External revealments thus subject the internal, and there is constant variance and confusion of faith. Man limits his understanding and blinds his perceptions by an external faith. He creates an external law, and through faith he deduces therefrom his truths or facts. He creates, for instance, a burning pit, because he believes he has discovered a law of vengeance. The simple, controlling law of love, is not received as the fundamental one, and therefore one thousand times one thousand may make ten thousand in his calculations. His abstract truth has been dependent upon a false law, and he deduces therefrom a false conclusion.

Is it not clearly perceivable in mathematical law, that no higher can contradict a lower? If God loves all men he can not hate a part. His love being revealed in the perceptions, it becomes an established law; and all truths that relate to his government, lying beyond observation, must be deduced from that law of love, and therefore eternal misery is known to be false through the revelation of a law.

It is only necessary, then, to establish a law, and all that lies beyond observation must reveal that law. Establish the fact that one person is made happy by a true life, then, it must be the law of happiness, and all that conduces to the establishment of the relations of a true life must result in the happiness of all. There will be no disagreement concerning the kingdom of heaven among those who perceive the law that produces its peace, for the reason will surely deduce therefrom a condition in accordance with the law of happiness.

We have stated that that is only abstract which is beyond observation and experience, and abstract truths become objective reali-

ties when revealed by observation and experience. Thus the kingdom of Heaven, its rest and its peace, is no imagined state to him who has found the law of its attainment through his perceptions, and has entered the relations that the law demands. His duties are not merely external enforcements, but are as recognizable as the pulsations of his heart. His speculations have then become realities through his conscious perceptions. Whatever lies beyond his experience he resolves by this law of his present experience, and thus God's government is measurably comprehended, precisely as the mathematician comprehends the limit of his measurement, and trusts it by the unity of mathematical law.

The enforcement of external law is demanded, while men trust alone the external; there can be no necessity for such enforcement when all have become a law unto themselves, for then the unity of the governing law of each will be apparent in *all*, and all will do the will of the Lord as they breathe the air, from natural desire, and not from enforcement or effort. Whatever is beyond present experience will be a higher manifestation of the same law, and harmonize in its fact with present facts, in its truth with present truths. What is now abstract, as moral duty and divine goodness, will then be objective through experience, and that alone will be limited which is in the limit of the mind. Bearing, then, this truth ever in mind, that no future revelations can contradict a present law, let us safely investigate what lies beyond our experience through our recognition of the unity of all law, and every development of law.

THE mind must be cultivated ere the soul can appreciate spiritual things. True indeed it is, that great learning is not a prerequisite of piety; but true it also seems to be, that gross ignorance is most unfavorable to its growth. Mere intellect, however capacious, may be unaccompanied by true wisdom; and men of great attainments are frequently led astray by their own vain imaginations.

WHENCE MUST COME REFORM?

IN a previous article, I have endeavored to demonstrate that the principles upon which our social and civil institutions were based, were in antagonism with the principles of the divine government, and that all the falsehood, injustice, crime and suffering found in society, in a great measure flowed from that antagonism ; that the great reform demanded was to so remodel society as to bring it into harmony with the divine government in relation to the individuality, sovereignty, and equality of man ; that the principles of all human governments, as well as the principles upon which men conducted their commercial intercourse with each other, were nothing less than the principles of force and fraud, converting society into a state of refined cannibalism. The positions I have taken can not be controverted, because they are so palpably true as to carry conviction in their very statement.

Those positions being true, a thorough and radical reform is imperatively demanded. And the question arises, by whose agency must it be brought about ? What instrumentalities must be employed ? Can we rely upon any means now in use for the accomplishment of so important a work ? I answer No. There are no means in progress either in church or state which are calculated to remedy these evils. There is no political party, there are no religious sects, which look to the accomplishment of any such object. The ends they have in view, the principles they acknowledge, and the means they use, antagonize with the principles of the divine government, and tend to increase rather than mitigate these evils.

We have seen that man as an immortal being, forming for himself a character which is to affect him eternally, is an individual separate from all other individualities ; and that his separate indi-

viduality must forever continue, and bear in itself the consequences of his individual actions, physical and spiritual. We have seen that he had within himself all the means of maintaining that individuality, if he was permitted to exercise them ; that is, with his existence he was endowed by his Creator with every faculty and right necessary for the proper development and perfection of that individuality. We have also seen that he had a sovereign right to exercise all those faculties and rights without any interference on the part of individuals or communities.

We have also seen that the exercise of all these faculties and rights is indispensable to him, to enable him to comply with the demands of his physical and spiritual nature, and thus fulfill his highest good and ultimate destiny. That he could not lose a single faculty, or part with, or be deprived of a single right without marring his manhood, and being rendered unfit for the position he was designed to occupy. Hence we were forced to the conclusion that all the rights appertaining to man were inalienable ; that they were indispensable to him to enable him to fulfill his destiny ; that, whether as an isolated individual, or as a member of society his individuality, sovereignty and equality must be preserved ; that he had a full and perfect right to a being on the earth, and to the free exercise of all those rights and faculties necessary to make that being a blessing to himself and the world ; and having that right, there was no authority on earth to restrain him in the exercise thereof.

We have also seen that all the moral and social evils which curse society, flow necessarily and inevitably from an infringement of these rights. There is no moral or social evil which can not be traced directly to such an infringement. And such infringements can not be practiced without begetting these evils. Therefore no religious sect, no political party, no association for reform, which will tolerate the infringement of man's individuality, sovereignty or equality, can be relied upon as an instrument calculated to remove the present evils of society.

Of all the futile means of reform, the present political organizations are the worst. Discarding in the outset all affinity for religion or morals, they make no appeal to the higher nature of man. They do not attempt to make men morally honest, upright and

just. They do not even deem it necessary that he should be so, to be qualified to fill the highest and most sacred places of honor and trust in the government. They discard all tests of morality; and the licentious, dissipated, vulgar, profane and despotic, oftener become prominent and petted politicians than those of a purer and better character. Their highest morality is to excuse themselves for doing wrong, lest a greater wrong should be done. "To choose the least of two evils" is the only approximation toward recognizing a distinction in favor of good, the political parties have ever made.

Their maxims are corrupt and corrupting in their influence. "To the victors belong the spoils," is a motto they both profess and practice; and their political battles are for the spoils, and not for right and justice. Every species of fraud and falsehood and corruption are practiced by those who strive for political success. "Everything is fair in politics," is another professed and practiced maxim. Forgery, misrepresentation, false philosophy, bribery, direct and indirect, false inducements, and everything which depravity can suggest is resorted to as legitimate and proper in a political contest. Avarice, lust, passion, appetite, malice, revenge, and every one of the baser qualities of the man are called into active exercise, and under present political organizations, every election sinks the community lower in the moral scale, than a whole year of the best moral and religious teaching and discipline can retrieve.

The fruits of this influence are seen in the immorality of government—are seen in the moral standing of those who fill the various political offices. The penitentiaries of our states do not present such scenes of dissipation, vice and crime, as flourish in our state and national legislatures. The members of these bodies, with very few exceptions, when they enter upon the discharge of their official duties, enter upon a scene of total abandonment to licentiousness and dissipation. In their legislative action, they are constantly under the influence directly or indirectly of bribing, or being bribed. "You go with me for this measure, and I will go with you for that;" "Vote for me for this office, and I will vote for you for that." These things being performed, they adjourn, some to the saloon and others to the embrace of harlots. Wherever

the legislature assembles, thither will the harlots congregate themselves, on the principle, "that where the carcass is, thither will the eagles be gathered together."

There is nothing, then, in the morality of the political parties, which will enable us to look to them as a means of reforming the characters of individuals and communities. We can not expect men to be made truthful, upright and just, by political influence. Then the only way we can expect any reform, through the agency of political organizations, must be from their teaching and practicing correct political principles. If they fail us here, our cause is hopeless with them, and they should be abandoned at once.

The principles upon which our reform must be based are, the individuality, sovereignty and equality of man. All his rights must be held sacred and inviolable, and must not be permitted to be infringed by any authority whatever, under any pretense or circumstances. Truth, justice and right must be maintained at all hazards. Political parties which do not recognize and practice these principles, can not become instruments of true reform. Hence the political parties, known under whatever name, must stand this test, or they can not be relied upon.

It is unnecessary to consider them separately as parties; for they are alike in principle and practice, in everything appertaining to the real evils which curse society. They both sustain the same principles which strike to the foundation of the sovereignty and equality of man, and it matters not which party bears rule, or whose measures are adopted; the laborer is equally the slave of capital under the administration of either. The time has never been, since the organization of our government, that the farmer, the mechanic or common laborer, could tell from his business whether a Whig or Democratic administration was in power. The quantity of wheat or corn, or other products of labor, produced or consumed, were not materially affected by the national administration. Demand and supply, and the laws of trade, continued to work out their results, independent of any political administration.

The laborer has not unfrequently been told that the price of labor would depend upon a change of administration, or upon a

continuance of it in power. The fact that certain articles at one time commanded a certain price under such an administration, and at another time commanded a different price under a different administration, has often been referred to by politicians, as proof that the one was a good, and the other a bad administration. They might with as much honesty, propriety and good sense, attribute an earthquake, a tempest or drought, to the administration, as our clergy sometimes do, as to attribute other influences they often do. The effect that demand and supply have upon price under our present system of commercial dealing, has already been examined, and there are many things affecting those relations which are beyond the influence of political governments. A frost, a drought, a continued season of wet and hurried weather, etc., at home or abroad, may so affect production as to cause a very material change in price. There are ten thousand causes of various kinds at work, which politicians are prone to hold their opponents responsible for, in the minds of the ignorant and uninitiated.

An administration may so interfere with the laws of trade, may so "tinker with the currency," as to affect in a great degree the interests of capitalists, and through them the interests of the laborer; for under our present system, labor being the slave of capital, whatever affects the master, directly or indirectly affects the slave; and this is the only way that labor is or can be materially affected by the administration. Let labor be emancipated from capital, and become independent, as it ought and must be, to obtain that which is equal and just, and Whig or Democratic administrations could not trifle with or affect the interests of labor.

I demonstrated in a previous article that there was nothing properly pertaining to government but protection. If individuals were not disposed to meddle with the rights of others through force or fraud, or if individuals could protect themselves against force and fraud, there would be no need of human governments. As human governments can not make laws, and are only valuable for the amount of force they can command, they can only affect men's relations to the divine government, by compelling them to assume certain positions in relation to the rights of others. Therefore all they can do is to protect men in the enjoyment of their

natural rights, by preventing others from infringing them, either through force or fraud. They can confer no rights upon them. They can permit certain classes to exercise certain powers and privileges which they deny to others; and thus permit one portion to trample on the rights of another portion. But after all, they do not alter the real rights of the parties; *they* remain unchanged.

I have already demonstrated that all governmental interference with the commercial and business transactions of men was fraught with the most pernicious consequences upon government and society; that it tended to render the government complex and unwieldy; that it tended to increase the number of offices and officers, and exerted a corrupting influence upon those who were charged with the administration of its affairs, and that in an especial manner did it tend to corrupt and deprave society; that it was fatal to integrity, honesty and uprightness, between man and man; that its influence was to substitute property or money for true uprightness and integrity of purpose. Therefore we are to expect no favorable influence from political organizations in any other way, than in the protection they afford to man as an individual.

Have we any political organizations recognizing the principles necessary to be observed, to afford every individual that protection he has a right to demand—of that which assumes the government of him. First, in respect to the sovereignty of the individual, and the inalienability of his rights, have we any political organization which recognizes any such doctrine? No proposition can be plainer than that every individual who exists upon the earth, has a right to so protect and defend that existence, as to make it a blessing to himself and his race; and that the very necessity which compels him to stand upon the earth and draw his support from her bosom, gives him a *right* to stand upon the earth and have access to her bosom; and that right is as inalienable as his existence. But our political organizations recognize no such right. They claim the authority, on the part of government and individuals, to monopolize the soil, and by force to exclude the race from it. Government first usurps the whole domain, and then levies tribute upon those who would occupy it—a tribute

first in the shape of price, and then perpetually after in the shape of taxes; and if the tribute is not paid, the poor laborer is turned into the streets, for he can be turned nowhere else, all but the highways being monopolized by government, or those holding office under her.

This principle of land monopoly is one of the most fruitful sources of fraud and oppression in existence. In no other way can labor be so unjustly and wickedly plundered as through the instrumentality of land monopoly, and nothing can be more arbitrary and despotic, or more unfounded in right than such a system. There can be no greater assumption or usurpation than to come between a man and his right to have access to the soil, for the purpose of supporting himself and those dependent upon him. The man or men who can usurp such authority, will be limited in their usurpations only by their power. They would as soon usurp the control of every other right or faculty of man, as that; and yet our political organizations are either too ignorant to know, or too dishonest to acknowledge, this inalienable right in man; and in either event, unfit to be trusted with the power to control the rights of man.

This subject is more fully considered in an article on land monopoly. Again, no political organization recognizes the inalienability of the rights of man, in any respect whatever. The doctrines of the Declaration of Independence are considered as mere "rhetorical flourishes," very pretty in theory, but not to be regarded in practice. Even the old Democratic party of which for many years I was an ardent and enthusiastic member, and which talks so loudly about equal rights and the interests of the poor, discards the doctrines of the Declaration of Independence, and, in theory and practice, declares that the rights of man are not inalienable. What is involved in the doctrine of the inalienability of human rights? This, plainly, that man by virtue of his humanity, has rights incident to his existence, which no power on earth is authorized to interfere with; that those rights are interwoven into his very being, and are inseparable from it. Does the great Democratic party hold to any such doctrine? Do they not hold that man may be robbed of his rights and may be placed under the dominion of another, who "may chain him, and task him and

exact his sweat with stripes, that mercy with a bleeding heart weeps when she sees inflicted on a beast?" "Do they not make it criminal for the poor victim to resist his oppressor, or in any manner to defend his inalienable rights? Is not the whole power and influence of the great democratic nation called into requisition to keep three millions of men, women and children in bondage—stripped of every right appertaining to humanity? And have they not purposely, deliberately, and with premeditation, legislated the means to keep these millions in bondage?

Again, has not this great democratic nation made it a highly penal offense to give comfort, protection, food, shelter, etc., to the escaping bondman? And are they not prompt to inflict those penalties upon those who violate their barbarous enactments? Now, what plea can the political parties offer in excuse of such conduct? Can they maintain the inalienability of human rights, without denouncing themselves as traitors to God and humanity? Do they set up the constitutional compact as a warrant for their proceedings? The constitution can give them no authority. Those who made the constitution had no more authority over the rights of man than you or I have. They had no more authority to bind a race of men and women in perpetual chains and slavery, than the humblest individual in existence. They could give no man any authority to exercise that power.

The fact that both political parties refer to the constitution for authority to enslave one-sixth portion of the people of these United States, is proof positive that they do not consider the rights of man as inalienable. They claim that they have been aliened, and that it is lawful and proper to so consider them. It is therefore the deliberate judgment of the great political organizations of this nation, that the rights of man are not inalienable; that man's right to life, liberty and property depends upon other conditions than that of his manhood. It is their deliberate judgment that more importance is to be attached to accidental conditions, than to humanity itself; or, to translate the matter into plain English, the political organizations of this country have no respect for the claims of justice and right. They do not recognize them as of any binding authority.

This conduct, when the question is between right and wrong,

justice and injustice, liberty and slavery, is indicative of character. It demonstrates that these parties are false to liberty and justice; that the difference they assume to pay to them is hypocritical, and is homage paid to other circumstances, and not to liberty and justice themselves. It demonstrates that when an individual can present no other cause for sympathy and protection, than the claims of justice and right, he may expect to be turned away unprotected and unredressed. It admonishes you and me that we have no security for the enjoyment of our rights any further than external circumstances shall compel these organizations to respect them. But should these circumstances change in relation to you or me, your family or my family, we are as liable to become their victims as the poor enslaved bondsman. We can not present our God-given rights and demand protection, because these organizations do not respect them.

Such being the character of these organizations, can they be relied upon where the naked question is at stake? Have they not shown themselves false? have they not shown themselves traitors to humanity? Have they not shown themselves traitors to the cause of liberty? and can traitors be trusted? Answer, Can traitors be trusted? Would they not as soon betray you and me, as others? If a man steals, he is pronounced a thief, and is set down as unworthy of confidence. Not because we know he will steal again, but because he has proved himself capable of stealing. He has proved himself dishonest and corrupt; he has demonstrated that he does not respect the claims of justice and right; so if a man robs; so if he counterfeits. The act proves the character, and the character cannot be trusted. Then why should those political organizations be trusted with the rights and liberties of the people, after they have demonstrated themselves to be traitors to those rights and liberties?

Can the laboring man, now a slave to capital, and chained down in slavery by the false principles of government and society, rely upon such traitors for redemption? I tell you, no! The reformer who strikes for the laborer must be stimulated by an interior love for truth, justice and right. He must rely upon the rewards of an approving conscience and an approving God. He must do battle for the just and the true, without hoping to be re-

warded by pecuniary advantage or honorable preferment. He must expect to be slighted by the wealthy and fashionable, and worldly noble; to have his name stigmatized, his views misrepresented, his motives impugned. He must expect to be denounced as an enthusiast, a fanatic, a disturber of society, and perhaps a Jacobin and infidel.

But again: these political organizations do not believe in the inalienability of human rights, as applicable to any class of men. If a majority shall legislate away the rights of the minority, and back that legislation by a sufficient power to enforce it, they believe it is the duty of the minority to submit; they say that man, on coming into society, surrenders up his rights to the disposal of society, and agrees to abide by their decision; and when the majority decides against him, his rights are gone. If it be so, what becomes of the inalienability of human rights? If, on coming into society, man is obliged to hold his rights subject to the will of the majority, what is that but holding the rights of man subject to the governing power? and what is there in absolute despotism more than this? The rights of man inferior to governmental authority! Did the patriots of the Revolution lie when they published that Declaration of Independence to the world? or are we false to those eternal principles and self-evident truths they affirmed?

From the foregoing considerations, we are led to infer that the laborer can not rely upon the moral or political influence of present political organizations to aid him in the work of redemption. If he wait for them to move in his behalf, he will die a slave, and bequeath an inheritance of servitude to his posterity. There are none to move in his behalf who look or hope for honorable distinction or political preferment in Church or State.

Can the laborer rely upon the Church for aid in this work of emancipation? If the Church were true to the principles of Christianity, or to the cause of true religion, he might have some hope from that source. But the Church is confessedly as corrupt as the world, for the very simple reason, that the barriers between the Church and the world are broken down. The standard of morality in the Church is such that the world finds no inconvenience in harmonizing their interests with it. In fact the Church

dare not elevate the standard of piety lest it should keep the world out; and then what would become of fine meeting-houses, fashionable congregations, and fat salaries. Religion has become popular with the world—why? Because the world has become converted to its meek, humble, self-denying truths and principles. I tell you, nay. The world is as vain, proud, selfish and corrupt to-day, as it was when it nailed Jesus to the cross. And let Christianity demand now what it then demanded, and it would be no more fashionable.

The land monopolist, the legal swindler, the idle and overreaching capitalist, the slave-holder and slave-catcher nestle in the bosom of the Church, and feel comfortable there. The Christianity thus taught and required to be practiced, is not warm enough to make their stay uncomfortable. The man ambitious for political or military distinction, although to be obtained by fraud and deceit in one case, and by shedding the blood of thousands in the other, can find no better starting-point in his career than in the Church. In morality, the Church and State are one; in political influence they are one, because they are but different phases of the same individuals.

Then why should not the Church be as corrupt as the State, with her standard of morality down upon a level with it, her members composed of those who are first and foremost in their pursuit after wealth, fame, power, and political and military honor. If there was ever occasion for Jesus to come and drive out of the temple those that buy and sell oxen, sheep and doves, and to overturn the tables of money changers in the Church, there is occasion now; for it has most literally become a den of thieves, and the true Christians in the Church know and feel it. The laborer, then, can not rely upon any religious organizations for aid in the work of redeeming himself.

The laborer must rely upon himself, must make himself a true man, and then aid in making others so. If the laborer will not put forth his exertions to redeem himself, he can be assured no organization will do it for him. Does he look for encouragement and support in the leading political parties of the day, those parties are officered by men whose interests and sympathies are on the other side. They trade in politics as they trade in goods and

wares ; they use the poor laborer as they use cents, to make change. Take away the political value of the laborer, let him become as worthless at the polls as is the slave or colored man, and they would reject them as base coin. You would find them as indifferent to the well-being of the poor laborer as they now are to that of the poor slave.

Can you hope to escape the evils of land monopoly under the political lead of either of the great political parties? The very men that lead those parties are land monopolists ; and many of them have accumulated immense fortunes out of the poor laborer, through the instrumentality of that very monopoly. The administration of the Federal Government has been in their hands ever since it was first established ; and has ever maintained and defended the principles of land monopoly. The partizans and pets of the various administrations, have ever been availing themselves of the monopoly of government, to fill their own coffers at the expense of the laborer. And the men who lead the political parties to-day, would resist to the death any attempt at interference with their monopoly.

Can you expect any aid from either of those parties in your efforts to escape the oppressions of capital? I tell you, nay ; those parties are under the control of capitalists. Those who form their issues, and plan political campaigns, are the capitalists and their wire-workers. The capitalist does not always appear as a leader, but he never fails to be represented in all great political movements. He has too much at stake under the present civil and social systems to leave political matters to be managed by those ignorant of, or adverse to, his interests. Under our present system, it is the principle part of the business of government to aid capitalists in making fortunes, and to aid them in protecting and securing them after they are made.

You might as well refer the lamb to the wolf for protection, as to refer the interests of the laborer to the present political organizations. These parties never speak or think of benefiting the laborer, except through the favor of capital. Whenever they talk of adopting measures which are to prove beneficial to the country, or to the producers of the country, they always speak of the measure as operating through the capitalist : as, "The capital-

ist will be induced to come among us;" "Money will flow into the state or community;" "Capitalists will be enabled to make more profitable investments, etc., etc." Now all this sounds very well in the ears of those who can not translate this language into plain English; but when translated, it sounds very differently. When a measure is adopted which is calculated to send capitalists among us to seek investments of their capital, the plain English of the matter is, the measure exposes the laborer to a little extra plunder, and the shrewd capitalist is after that *extra hide*. The capitalist is true to his instinct; and that instinct is for gain, which consists in appropriating that for which he does not render a full equivalent.

I have already said that the leaders of the present political organizations trade in politics, as they trade in any other marketable commodity. Those who make politics the business of their lives, must make it a means of yielding them a subsistence. They follow it as they would any other profession, and the end they have in view is personal gain or honor. They use the masses as so much small change, that is in demand only at the particular time it is wanted. The poor laborer who has no vote to cast, is without value, and consequently is never in demand among the trading class. These men profess great love for the dear people, and talk long and loud about equal rights, and the interests of labor, etc. But they do it with an eye single to the vote they hope to obtain. They will sing any song, make any private promise, provided by so doing they can count votes. But when the bargain is struck, and the vote obtained, what becomes of the promise?

With all their love for the poor laborer, not the first step will they take to emancipate him from capital—not the first blow will they strike at land monopoly. With all their devotion to liberty and equal rights, they will put up for their standard-bearers men who all their lives have stood upon the necks of the bleeding and crushed slave—who have all their life time spurned and contemned the claims of justice and right. They will boast of their attachment to the principles of liberty, and at the same time pass the most stringent laws to keep millions of unoffending beings in hopeless bondage.

Therefore, I say again, the political and religious organizations of this country can not be relied upon for assistance to redeem the laborer from the dominion of capital. The laborer must do the work himself. He must bring all the power and energy of his being to bear upon the social and civil institutions under which he lives. He should at once withdraw himself from organizations under the control of those whose interest consists in enslaving and crushing him. Let labor be true to itself. It is the great pillow upon which the commercial world rests, and without which it could not stand a single day. Then why should it be chained in the market, and be made to cringe and bow before capital?

Up, laborers! Address yourself to the work of self-redemption. Stand forth in the dignity of your manhood. Take the position your importance to the world entitles you to occupy: first and foremost in the ranks of society, redeem your profession from the odium and contempt cast upon it by the idle, proud and fashionable world, by redeeming yourselves from slavery. Let the servility of labor cease. Let it be the action of free men, working for *themselves* and not for lordly masters. Be no longer duped by priest or politician. Society must be reformed, and you must reform it; man must be redeemed, and you must become the instruments of redemption. Be united, be firm, and be patient, and the work will be easy. With you rests the *power*; you have only to exercise the *will*, and it will be done.

He who has a love for human nature can never be alone. In the shells he picks up on the shore—in the leaf, fading at his feet—in the grain of sand and the morning dew—he sees enough to employ his mind for hours. Such a mind is never idle. He studies the works of his Maker which he sees all around him, and finds a pleasure of which the devotee of sin and folly can form no conception.

WHO WILL BE HOLY?

A SERMON BY AN UNORDAINED PREACHER.

"Let a man examine himself."—ST. PAUL.

"Create in me a clean heart, O God."—DAVID.

"Thou hast constituted my endeavor."—FENELON.

WE propose to consider man's relations to the world without, and through his condition, endeavor to learn the laws of his being; for we shall find that every act and every impulse is as perfectly in accordance with divine law and order, as is the motion of the planets in the heavens, and the growth of the seed of the husbandman. The investigation of these laws tends to aid mankind in this wise: He who perfectly understands the governing power of his life, who has learned of causes and conditions, will more readily bring himself into harmony with higher relations, and thus renounce his subjection to the lower, which, though perhaps ignorantly yielded to, yet are the fruitful source of misery, and become the barrier to the kingdom of heaven—the angel with flaming sword to drive him from paradise.

Each one feels himself to be a free and independent being, subject to his own will, and with power limited alone by his capacity; yet each one is also conscious of a governing power, stronger than will, that leaves him no choice, and is at once the arbiter of his life, and the controller of his destiny. These seemingly contradictory intuitions arise from his conscious individuality, which makes him Lord, not only of all lower forms of life, but of his own acts, and also his inner consciousness of connection with God, and therefore subject to the laws of Divinity. Consciousness is the first condition of individualized spirit. Man in his consciousness of union with all matter through his animal nature, and with all spirit through his divine, feels this sense of in-

dependence and helplessness, of freedom and subjection, of entireness and partiality.

Individual progress is subject to *finite* relations and conditions. *Infinite* progress is subject to infinite relations, and therefore is harmonious and never-changing; or we might state the proposition thus: individual progress is the result of infinite relations, yet expressed in finite, and therefore its conditions are changeable and inharmonic; but infinite progress *through* finite relations, is harmonious and never-changing. Each individual is governed by the laws that govern the whole, and can not be separated from the whole; yet in his relations and conditions he is finite, and his progress is limited to these finite relations and conditions.

We find man conscious of divine life, yet so debased by his animal and lower nature as to be subject unto it; and the law of his condition leaving him no choice, he becomes the creature of sensualism and the slave of lust.

Is there then no higher law that still controls and moves in this condition and under these circumstances?

We will first consider the extent of man's free will. By no choice of his own, the child enters the first sphere of active life. The result of true or false relations, he inherits a perfect, or illy organized body. He finds himself governed by desires he can not control, by impulses he may not subdue; conditions surround him that he must yield to; influences govern him, he knows not when or how. At each turn impressions stamp themselves upon his soul; the world without has transferred itself to the world within, and translates itself in each act and each desire; and thus at the age of manhood or womanhood, the individual stands an active agent for good or ill. He feels a desire, but whence comes it? From the nature that he has through these years been developing to beauty or deformity. He is impelled to an act, but from whence? From that desire which is the expression of the condition, the effect of true or false relations. His free will is, then, to do what his nature impels him to do, and that nature has been the result of manifold effects over which he had no individual control. Therefore in studying man we must study his relations and conditions; and learning the law of his being, through these find the remedy for inharmony. For too often this thousand-stringed

harp knows no accord; vibrating eternally, it gives forth no melody, but wakens the wail of sorrow and pain.

Our first investigations must ever commence in ourselves. Man stands at the head of all material expression of life; and here we may define what we designate as material and spiritual. All life being of and from God, and progressing ever toward the divine, we can separate no expressions of that life, and place them between barriers, but only on the spiral chord that connects all with the highest; but matter as expressive of *form*, is distinguished from matter as expressive of spirit. Life pervading each is one and the same in different degrees of development; but life having become developed to consciousness becomes spirit, as mineral having become developed to organization becomes vegetable, and the vegetable to sensation becomes animal. Spirit then we denominate life, having reached the development of conscious individuality. Man then stands the link between the material and the spiritual; allied to all lower forms, and yet connected in his consciousness to the divine, he holds within himself the power of the lower and is subject unto the higher. To study one's self, then, means not merely the study of the body with its bones, muscles, and sinews, or the mind with its reason, its affection and its will; but it is the searching into the elements and principles of nature and reaching even unto the divine. We can not commence this study lightly, we can not limit our possible investigation. Sacredly we place our foot on the stepping-stone to this height, for the spot whereon we stand is holy ground.

Matter and spirit obey the same harmonious laws; differing in degree, they differ in manifestation, but in studying of one we learn of the other. Will you watch the insect that crawls at your feet, and learn of its habitation, of its food, of the laws of its being, then you investigate the principles of your highest aspirations. What moves the insect to seek its food, or choose its dwelling, but the desires of its nature, but its instinct; man, too, in his desire loves, hopes, aspires. Just within my hand lies a sunbeam; the law of light makes it no wonder to me; but let me study its concentration, its limitation, and I shall know more of the divine light, that through the all-pervading atmosphere of spirit makes me to know beauty, order, harmony, heaven. In these investi-

gations there must be no fear or restrictions, since, if we would know of infinite love, we must study its manifestation in every finite expression that we can comprehend; if we would know of infinite power, we must set no limits to our conception of it; if we would attain unto the highest, we must do so through every faculty, desire, and impulse of our being. The kingdom of Heaven has no sanctified gate through whose narrow portal the seeker reaches the peace within its walls; but through varied paths, by manifold ascents, is attained the height from whence the glory is revealed, that no longer concentrates in a limited domain, but is the all-embracing, universal sympathy, whose light knows no shadow and whose extension is measureless.

The law of all life is union; in matter it expresses itself in new forms of development; in mind, in desires and impulses, that take form in action for the gratification of those desires. Whether we give the terms of sympathy, hope, aspiration, all arise from this governing law of life, and union is the result of the gratification of their desire. It expresses itself in different modes of manifestation, and becomes the creator of new forms. This desire is the development of the affections, which become subject unto the merely animal nature, unto the intellectual, the spiritual, or harmoniously unite the three. Then the simple statement, that if our desires are holy our acts are holy, if our desires are sensual, our acts are on that plane, would cover the whole ground of man's condition, if he were uninfluenced from without; certainly, here must commence individual reform. The contending elements, the discord and derangement, can only be made harmonious by this moving power of all life. If we will look for a moment to the developments of life beneath man, we shall see this law becomes the creator of ever changing forms and relations. The seed vegetates because of the law; the plant grows, the moisture nourishes; the earth assimilates, all because of this union of particle with particle—this lower expression of desire or sympathy. In the higher manifestation it becomes instinct. The animal nourishes his body, grows, moves, all by the law of instinct, or this higher development of desire, and its gratification by the assimilation of particle with particle. In man is combined the animal instinct, and the higher form of spiritual sympathy, which has

resulted from these lower manifestations, and is a link in the progressive chain of all life.

Now each feels within himself impulses that demand expression—desires that seek gratification. *These are the divine revelators of the Divinity.* But here perfectly understand the distinction. Man linked unto all lower forms, and also unto higher expressions of spiritual life, has within him the impulses and attractions of *both*. His strong animal nature allies him to the brute; his spiritual attractions make him an angel. Now these affections are subject and controllable, because by motion and change all life is assuming new forms and entering new relations. It is by its law. Unity of development depends upon harmony of conditions. Let us look at man as we find him. Where does he lean? toward animal instinct, or desire, or spiritual aspiration? If the former, then must our aim be to lift him one round in the ladder of progress. Now the instincts lead man to seek food; it is the necessary demand of his life, and his appetite is the expression of this demand. This is the call of his animal nature, and becomes, by its connection with the understanding, the consciousness of a want. He gratifies it, and it is well; but when this demand becomes the subjector of the higher nature, then appetite becomes passion, and food the nourisher of this animal propensity; then demand becomes perverted, and not natural by the law of life. Thus it is with all men's desires that become lusts and passions. Perverting them from their true legitimate use, at last the higher nature is answered on the lower plane; and here stands man, made in the image of God, a little lower than the angels, a brute in instinct, and in the expression of that instinct.

We have said however, that he is subject to relations. There is then this governing power to control this governing instinct. You may desire to-day to drink a glass of brandy; this desire may arise from a natural demand for some stimulant. It may be the effects of former intemperance in some form and the reaction; it may be the call for renewed life, and you being ignorant of the supply, or having left your animal nature to answer the call, seek it in sensuous gratification. If you indulge, then, to-morrow you will still feel the demand, and very probably an increased one. The *demand* is right; it is by the law of your being; it is the in-

stinct God planted in your soul; without it you were worse than a cold stone, for that has its demand and supply by the law of its attraction; but if you answer this demand by the gratification of your sensual desires, then are you subjugating the desire unto the animal; then are you degrading the life of God within you, to the lowest animal impulses. Let a wise hand take from you this glass, and give you the stimulus of active effort or kindly sympathy, and your soul satisfied, takes of its bread and its wine, and is filled. This is the changed relation, the condition that has governed the instincts. Is there not included here all of philanthropic effort? Our prisons shut up the offender, and the thief will not steal, the murderer kill; and if you change sufficiently his conditions to satisfy his impelling desire on another plane, you have reformed him; but take him to your home and heart, and what will be the effect of that change of relations?

Yet these are external means; there is a higher, because more divine, power that must be to the individual its *redeemer*. It is the voice of the divinity that will not be silent amid all the confusion of inharmony. It becomes the individual effort of progress. No inebriate rests in his debasement, or epicure in his gratification, or licentious in his sensualism, without feeling the flow of this divine life that calls unto him to assert his divinity. It is through this *internal* consciousness that all *external* effort becomes availing.

Did time permit, we might go back to the earliest development of life, when the embryo child feels the governing impulse of parental desire, and grows into individual consciousness, subject to passions and lusts, or to the divine instinct of conjugal love; we might present to your responsibility, might tell you how each desire stamps itself upon the child, until there is expressed the beauty of holiness or the deformity of sensualism. Then following up the long line of causes and effects, see the man or woman what inheritance, society, custom have made; but in this labor we should need the wisdom of a God, and the holiness of a seraph, and still should use but the *external* means of awaking a sense of the responsibility of each individual. Within your own souls is kindled the light; it lighteth every man that cometh into the world. To awaken thought is our only effort;

to suggest the cause of disorder our best endeavor; for within you lies the remedy. We see how wonderfully the body expresses its recuperative power. Wound your flesh, shiver your bones or stretch your ligaments, and the life within you gives of its balsam to heal, its strength to restore, and its instinct to contract, and every effort is to make perfect again the injured physical structure. Is the blood impure, it sends its impurity to the surface. Is the digestion imperfect, the food is rejected; and thus, through the whole animal economy, health is the law and the endeavor, and disease is but the attempt of life to become health. Is there not, then, in the higher or spiritual body, also its recuperative power? Has it not its instincts of repulsion, of attraction, its balsam and its strength? There is no law for the material that is not an expression of a spiritual law. The body claims its food; so does the spirit. As the body, with its instinct of life and preservation, with its effort to attain harmony, makes known to the consciousness its needs, so the higher, more refined life claims its supply, and the abundance of food for one is equal to the abundance for the other. But the possibility of obtaining the food for the soul being dependent upon the soul's highest life, and man being developed more directly in the material, he often considers the call for spiritual food but the natural body expressing its desire, and answers it on the plane of sensuous gratification. Here, then, is the fruitful cause of inharmony; not in the desire or propensity (which results from the divine life of the individual) making itself known unto the consciousness, but by its being answered, through ignorance, on the lower plane of self-gratification, and thus becoming lust and passion. It was of this that Paul spoke when he warned his disciples not to become subject unto the flesh; when he entreated them to crucify the body.

The first endeavor of each individual should be to learn what are his natural desires, and then whether he is supplying them from the table of the Lord abundantly spread. The spiritual body depending upon the natural, and the natural upon the spiritual, each seeks, in the true harmonic man, the perfection of the other. The body assimilates the food until it becomes, through varied change, the thought that aspires to heaven. The spirit

also receives into its consciousness the wants of the body, and gives of its will and energy to satisfy the desire; man labors to attain the gratification of his needs, and by his labor his body becomes more active and his mind more resolute. No necessity injures the body or spirit in its supply. It is only when the necessity becomes the ruling desire, and subjugates the higher and nobler faculties, so that all the powers of mind and body are bent on the one effort of gratification, that the law, which, in its enforcement tends to harmony, in its relations becomes discord.

Do you desire wealth—and for what? If for honor, splendor, the world's admiration, then have you converted the legitimate demand for the supply of the necessities of the body, into lust and passion, and are far from the kingdom of heaven. Would you feast upon the luxuries of the earth? If you would sustain your physical body thereby, giving unto bone, sinew and muscle their needed nourishment, then you obey the law of the Lord; but if you eat or drink for mere pleasure, then do you become subject unto the flesh, and degrade the image of God. If you enter the holy relation of marriage that your soul may obtain its entireness, that the law of union may be obeyed in the noblest relations of life, then you are a servant of God, and doing his bidding; but if you marry or are given in marriage from convenience, policy, or from the desire to gratify the animal passions, then do you place in the temple of the Lord the table of the money-changers, and defile it with the unholy. Do you beget children from a desire to supply the want of parental instinct, and make your noblest affections the seat of your highest aspirations, then is the divine speaking unto you, and your response is, "Here am I, Lord;" but if you take upon yourself the responsibility of a creator through the unholy desire of self-gratification, then are you making yourself the instrument of misery, and your noblest office your curse and shame. Do you desire the love of God? If this be the aspiration of your soul reaching unto its highest conception, then is your soul coming nearer unto the divine, and your life into oneness with the Father. But if you desire his love that he may bestow upon you temporal blessings, or through external means advance you unto

happiness, then do you subjugate your noblest aspirations unto selfish demand, and linking yourself with stronger bonds unto the material, weaken the chain that binds you to the spiritual, and remove yourself from your best good.

Thus it is with all your desires. In themselves holy and divine, given us through our nature, and being the bonds that connect us with earth and heaven, making us sons of men and of God, they bring us holiness, happiness, heaven—or misery, death, hell, precisely as we subjugate them unto the spiritual, or they subjugate the spiritual unto the animal. Here must commence all reform. In vain are moral codes, in vain written commandments, if within your own consciousness the voice of the Divinity speak not to you and be not heard, for "having ears you hear not." The arbitrary rules that are laid down for the attainment of purity and holiness, must be received into the consciousness, and awaken there the perception of attainment, else they avail not. Your physician may restrict your diet; and through your reverence for long-established science, he may save you suffering; but there is a diviner physician of the soul, whose holy commands need no scientific confirmation or written tablets, and who speaks to you, ever calling you to health, and revealing the law of life. Your pastor may present you with the precepts of morality, and give you the code of ethics; but the good God has written those laws on your heart, and he who runs may read; he has placed the light within your soul, and it shineth within the darkness, a revelation of his love, and of your union with him. Jesus constantly referred his disciples to this necessary attainment of holiness through the soul's own life. All the law and the prophets could not bring the kingdom of righteousness, because they expressed the exterior efforts of acquiring good. The little seed was in the heart that must become a great tree. The light was in the soul which was to shine unto the perfect day. The external means of attaining unto perfection are numerous; but the power that is to be moved lies in the soul, and external means can awaken it. A little leaven will leaven the whole lump; but the acting elements are all there, the combination and re-combination takes place from the inherent properties of the mass.

Many movements of reform have been carried on with effect within the last few centuries, and we find they tend to bring man into his natural condition, both in regard to his physical and his spiritual being, and result in true independent manhood and womanhood. When Luther came with his powerful protestations, it was to assert his freedom of thought, his divine power of interpreting the will of God. The subjection to the Church was the external bondage that made mankind an instrument in the hands of arrogant assumption and sanctified tyranny. The freedom of the individual was made the servant of combined power, and the result was a concentrated action for external influence, instead of the internal triumph of individual supremacy. With his great heart moved by the impulses of freedom, he went forth to proclaim man's divinity through his individuality, and left the world prepared to interpret the Bible in its conscience. Protestantism is the result, that nearer approach to the attainment of individual supremacy.

In the science of medicine, Pressnitz asserted the power of his divine instinct by listening to the voice of nature, and supplying the feavered body with its natural demands. Science yielded its fixed laws; and who of the learned faculty now does not permit the use of water as a remedial agent? Howard let his affections govern his intellect and his will, and behold the reforms of our prisons. Swedenborg subjected the intellect and heart unto the spiritual, and the world *knew* of a hereafter; and to discourse with angels was no longer a miracle for the first century, or a dream for those following.

Thus we see all reforms commenced their work through the power of the divine life, left to act upon the natural man, and, by bringing unto men the knowledge of the soul's own power, and showing that the divine instinct is the Lord, whose cry of entreaty we reject, and whose heaven we can aspire unto only through truth, purity and holiness, expressed through the loves of the soul. The varied lessons that have been taught by human progress, are only learned through the soul's perception of their harmony with its own endeavors. I could never realize the devotion of Howard, except through my own active benevolence. I could not understand the spiritual perception of Swedenborg

save through the influx of spiritual light into my own soul. Therefore all reformers teach us through ourselves, as all reforms commence in ourselves.

It was a saying of De Follet's, that man receives his affections from the present, his intellect from the past, and his spirituality from the future; which has more significance than at first seems; since his heart brings him into relations with the present, and is the mover and projector of his present activities; the past brings unto his intellect its accumulated wisdom and experience, while his spirit is the revelator of the future and the inspirer of its hopes. The past must teach us through its harmonious revelations with the present. The future too finds its expression now, and thus we learn of all things through our interpretation of our received *legacy* and our *expected inheritance*.

We conceive of the passions of men through our own passions, of their benevolence through our own—their avarice, their selfishness through ours; and as each soul tends toward its entireness, it must express in every faculty, attribute, propensity, the aspiration of each other. The life of the meanest wretch expresses in its degree the life of the seraph, and he who enters into the sanctuaries of his heart, and learns the desires and impulses of his being, will *never* condemn another. The infinite reveals itself through finite relations, and thus the harmony of all development is subject only unto those *relations*, and not unto the instincts that must have in them unlimited capacity, and in their expression be the *activity of Divinity*.

No *false relations* change the germinal instincts in their nature; they only develop them inharmoniously. Therefore relations become responsible for discord. A musical instrument most clearly expresses this condition of inharmony, since all expressions of harmony are in accordance with the laws of melody. You have your many strings, but they jar; you awaken a chord, it is discord. The instrument is there, the power is not wanting; let the chords be made sympathetic, and then vibrates forever the harmony. Harmony, then, is the expression of accordant relations. Man's impulses must be *attuned*, not destroyed; they do not harmonize or vibrate not in harmony with the divine. The contentions concerning natural abilities, the pride of acquisition, the ar-

rogance of possession, all vanish before this view of man's relations. Subject unto the life that is in itself divine, the ruling passions must be made to develop that life. They must discourse its harmony, must be attuned to its key. To teach the lesson of morality, Jesus made his acts express his relations. *His* judgment was never of instinct, but of disorder. His command, "Go and sin no more," was the rebuke of the sin, not the sinner. His aspersions were of the false expressions of harmony: "Woe unto you hypocrites," was the judgment and condemnation of assumption and insincerity. The judgment of mankind generally is of individuals, not of relations. "Will you not consider who made you, and who placed you in this sphere of attainment, and be humble and say, I wait thy will, for thou hast constituted my endeavor, and subjected my desire; and I will bless thee alone, my God," said the inspired Fenelon.

That charity which discerns the law of life, and perceives the influences that have made men what they are, is the fulfillment of the law of Love. The judgment of another is in fact a judgment of one's self. As has before been stated, we can perceive no impulse or desire but through our own natures, so we can perceive the relations of others only by understanding our own; and those impulses subject unto those relations, having formed individual character, we have no cause for condemnation. "For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged."

The moving incentive of mind, then, being its desire, our reforms of self and the world must be to make the desires holy, through the higher ruling love that is unto the affections, the life and soul, the breath of God, and which expresses itself in the charity that thinketh no ill. The organs of the body strengthen by use. The arm of the laboring man has full muscles, the public speaker increases the power of his vocal organs, the pedestrian has full limbs, and the student an active brain. The exercise of any organ or faculty of the mind tends to develop it; memory is strengthened, the power of concentration increased, the perceptions quickened by use. So with all the affections, fraternal, parental and filial love; and thus it is with all the desires that have their seat in the affections. If you give free gratification to your love of gain you will become a miser, unless the fraternal love is

quickened and exercised, so that your benevolence makes your abundance bless others, or some other ruling love counteracts your acquisitiveness. If you indulge your appetite, that appetite becomes perverted, unless your caution is active or some stronger love prevents its indulgence.

Now if each individual will commence the investigation of his ruling loves, he will find on what plane they are, since with all these instincts the understanding has a connection; and the consciousness is not lost amidst the greatest disorder. If your lust of power is your ruling passion, pause and see how you satisfy it. If on the low plane of worldly gratification, then learn that the only possible means for the attainment of harmony lies in your subjection of this unto the spiritual love, that seeks no good save of the whole, and loses self in the universality of its love. If you covet wealth and spend your best energies for the gratification of it, then limit your endeavors and curb your inclination until you behold the free and loving kindness of God, who spreads upon the earth beauty and richness without limit or distinction. So with all your desires, let individual harmony be the result of individual effort. Then is the kingdom of Heaven at hand, and beauty, holiness, happiness the inheritance.

In this work man labors not alone. The affections call unto him co-laborers. The links that connect each soul to its sphere of attractions in this life, make him to know that he works with good and noble men, and that each victory over himself is a victory gained for another. Will your companion of yesterday, finding you to-day enjoying other life, other pursuits, be satisfied in your former sphere? He too will learn of new relations, new conditions, and led by the magnetism of your love, be lifted into those higher relations. From the invisible world of Spirit, too, feel the attracting chord drawing you to your best endeavor, and making you at one with the life of a world where desires take the place of forms, and those desires become the spheres of action. From the loving hearts hear the approving "Well done, good and faithful servant, enter into the joy of your Lord." The higher the advancement one makes in his individual capacities, the more clearly is revealed to him the beauty, order and perfection of all existence, for the love of God is known through his

own love. Through every link of his progress is revealed the unity of his development, and aspiring unto greater heights, he becomes at one with the Father, and learns the conquest of life to be the noblest effort of the human soul. The aspiration for holiness then becomes his ruling power; and uniting the physical with the spiritual the harmony is complete, and the entireness of man makes him a son of God.

But, as we have said, this condition can only come through his entire nature. As he must subject his desires to their highest expression and make use subservient to development, so he must not leave unexercised any of these desires. All are divine, and in the perfect man must have development and exercise. Through infinite channels is expressed infinite love. He who through his highest attainment would come into sympathy with that love, must rest in no *partial* expressions of it. Every relation of life tends to develop it; every experience to call it into exercise. As you obey the voice of God in your impulses, you express the divine harmony; and filial, fraternal, conjugal, parental love, all develop the highest nature, and make known unto the consciousness the divinity. So does the gratification of the senses, by every revealment of beauty, tend toward the attainment of a true life. The rose of summer does its office—the creeping grass, the autumn aster. The image of the beautiful landscape stamps itself on the spirit, and the world without is transferred unto the world within. Art ennobles; taste refines; each coveted pleasure has its means of gratification, and each desire prophesies the supply. But the world that man enters with these god-like attributes—with these finite expressions of infinite aspirations in every department of his being—places before him few of the conditions necessary for their gratification. Therefore, often the germ is not quickened into active life. The sensuous overcome all other instincts, and man lives and dies having never known his own possible attainment. The one propelling, stronger power has kept in check all others. Therefore we see men of fully organized intellect—men of large ideality—men of natural benevolence, all bent in the great pursuits of wealth or worldly honor. The *relations* here have over-mastered the natural bias. "How hardly shall they that have riches enter the kingdom of Heaven" or true harmonic con-

dition, since the stronger love of self-gratification prevents the development of the other faculties of the mind and heart, or makes their exercise but the means of advancing the ruling love.

What would you attain? Heaven? its peace and rest—its joy and security? Its immediate attainment lies not through the gate of the beautiful called Death. Even there you may not find it. The kingdom of Heaven is within you. Attain unto it by a full exercise of all your powers—by a natural and true gratification of every divine instinct—by a subjection of the unholy unto the holy—of the impure unto the pure, and you need have no shadow between you and your desire. Heaven is here; the light is revealed in your souls; the beauty, harmony, peace and rest are all yours; the companionship of angels is yours. Ever nearer, they come drawn by the sympathy of your perfected bodies and souls, and you commune with them daily and hourly. Pure thoughts flow into your soul; glorious truths reveal themselves. Earth has no shadow, for God is the light of it, and his love the warmth, his peace the rest. Is there nothing worth striving for here?—a sacrifice that will be too great for the attainment?

Lift a little the veil that keeps from you the light that is ever about you, and behold how the bright chords connect you with a higher life. Watching eyes, helping hands, loving hearts wait for the moment when they may bring you the bread of life, when they may give you to drink of the living waters, when they may restore your soul, may lead you in green pastures and beside the still waters. For are they not all ministering Spirits, waiting alone for the condition when they may approach you through your sympathy allied to theirs, by your relations of harmony with them; waiting to guide you to the attainment of that condition; to enlighten you when you are ignorant, to strengthen you when you are weak, to heal you when you are sick? and yet their power must be exercised through yourself. Were it not so, all men were within the fold of the shepherd of love. For though an angel from Heaven speak unto you, you know it not, unless you have through your aspirations opened your ears to hear.

No external means is availing, save as it acts upon the inmost or soul through sympathy or oneness; that is the reason that

Jesus besought his disciples to come into nearest relations to him and the Father, that they might attain his peace, and do his works and prove to the world the reality of Heaven. Then would the Father's will be expressed in their lives, and be the constant revealment of his love unto the world ; then would *God be manifest in the flesh.*

Men make the life of Jesus an exception, or else doubt the truthful history of it. Whereas Jesus through his perfection, showed the possibility of every human soul; and yet to greater heights should they attain. "For greater works than these shall ye do." There can be no limit to human progress. Holiness, happiness, heaven is not the *end*. Still entering new relations, still obeying the law of all life, the soul progresses eternally. No distance measures its soaring ; no limit marks its aspiration. Learn, then, how noble is the body, the temple of the divine Spirit; and uniting both in the one aim of perfection, come into communion with the Father, and do his will in the courts of Heaven.

THERE is almost always a subduing, refining, and spiritualizing influence emanating from the seeming evils of physical affliction. Under the silent influence of many diseases, the material temple is made, as it were, to crumble and fall piece by piece, to the earth ; but under the same quiet influence the indwelling spirit—the immortal mind unfolds its delicate and youthful proportions, day by day, and hour by hour, until it is prepared to tread the sunny paths, to inhale the fragrant odors, and to associate with the radiant inhabitants of the superior country. Disease is a strange and unnatural process by which to subdue and purify, and bring the soul into conjunction with the superior and eternal ; but it is a revolutionizing ordeal, and in this sense should ever be regarded as a blessing, and sustained with patience and composure.

THE REAL AND IDEAL.

Without the spiritual, observe,
The natural's impossible ; no form,
No motion ! without sensuous, spiritual
Is unappreciable ; no beauty or power !
And in this twofold sphere, the twofold man
Holds firmly by the natural, to reach
The spiritual beyond it—fixes still
The type with mortal vision, to pierce through,
With eyes immortal, to the ante-type
Some call the ideal—better call the real,
And certain to be called so presently
When things shall have their names. Look long enough
On any peasant's face here, coarse and lined,
You'll catch Antinous somewhere in that clay,
As perfect-featured as he yearns at Rome
From marble pale with beauty ; then persist,
And, if your apprehension's competent,
You'll find some fairer angel at his back,
As much exceeding him, as he the boor,
And pushing him with empyreal disdain
Forever out of sight. * * *

—“There's nothing great
Nor small,” has said a poet of our day,
(Whose voice will ring beyond the curfew of eve,
And not be thrown out by the matin's bell)—
And truly, I reiterate, “Nothing's small!”
No lily-muffled hum of summer bee,
But finds some coupling with the spinning stars ;
No pebble at your foot, but proves a sphere ;
No chaffinch but implies the cherubim ;
And, glancing on my own thin, veined wrist,
In such a little tremor of the blood
The whole, strong clamor of a vehement soul
Doth utter itself distinct. Earth's crammed with heaven,
And every common bush afire with God ;
But only he who sees, takes off his shoes ;
The rest sit round it, and pluck blackberries,
And daub their natural faces unaware
More and more from the first similitude.

From Aurora Leigh.

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.

L. M. WHITCOMB.

WHEN Alcibiades desired to learn the cause of the dissensions between the philosophers of those days, Socrates said unto him, "You will labor in vain, for that which makes men differ in doctrines is only the difference in themselves; and as a man can only know himself, he can only know in himself the differences of others; then study your own doubts and belief, and know all you will know of others' philosophy." So, at the present day, when we attempt to understand the various doctrines termed religious, or principles termed philosophic, we find we must measure them by our own, and in doing so, the truth we accord to each will be the correspondence of it to our own standard of truth. But in such study in the past, we have a measure in the influence that we perceive those religions and philosophies left upon the ages that produced them, that we can not have in the present. We are, however, often obliged to depend for our knowledge upon a record, which is too often only another person's study of truth, and the measure of it by their standard. As the history of events, when it goes beyond mere facts, can teach us little, so the history of philosophy or religion can teach us only as the fundamental truths and principles are given to us uninterpreted by another.

The religions of the ancients are of less importance to us than their philosophies, because religion was more the result of a combination of external influences wrought out into a faith, thus giving forms and ceremonies, instead of interior life and action. Those philosophers who defined the central thought around which sects classed themselves, were the true representatives of the people's progress in spirituality; and as such, in learning

of their influence, we learn the progress of spiritual life, and the causes that produced the rise and fall of peculiar sects.

We find one great truth expressed in all these sects—the centralization of thought. Disciples grouped themselves around an expounder of a truth, and clung tenaciously to every false exposition as to the self-evident ones; thus showing that thought and opinion are subject to individuality, and that what one receives through another is almost invariably tinctured by that one's individuality. We find also that the doctrines were based upon truths and principles which are self-evident, and result from intuitional perception. Their reception, then, depended upon the intuitional perception of these truths, but the deductions therefrom depending upon individual peculiarities, the reception of the deductions depended upon that law of mind which we term influence, or the power of one to act upon another, when that power is established through sympathy. This sympathy may exist only on one plane, or in one faculty, and yet all planes and all faculties are led by this one impelling power. Thus sects are easily established, and their extent and influence will depend upon the extent of the sympathy that is created. Thus, in religions, if one takes hold of a popular and much-loved truth, and makes that the foundation of his doctrines, he will not lack followers. All act through this power who endeavor to make proselytes to any particular sect, and most men understand it who attempt to move the multitude. We need not then wonder at the absurdity of any doctrines held or inculcated, if we can find a popular one among them, around which others center, and which appeals to man's intuitions, and depends upon those for recognition.

Many of the ancient philosophers distinguished themselves by a fearlessness in presenting a peculiar doctrine when they were not bound by a religious bigotry; and, therefore, we find whatever thought had the ascendancy in their teachings, had more effect upon individual character. All the philosophy, prior to the birth of Jesus, that was not connected with the Hebrew nation, was as varied in its presentation of truth as were the various minds that presented it, for there was lacking the central power of a peculiar religious faith, around which the philosophy

should revolve. In the Hebrew nation the philosophy was as varied, except that it always clung to the sacred revelations of truth, and bound itself to the interpretation by others. Thus David, in his sympathy with the human heart, and in his instinctive recognition of its wants, found a philosophy as wide as his affections, and gave it expressive beauty; but he at the same time limited it by his religious bigotry, and thus made it a continuance of error. Solomon, whose knowledge of the secret springs of action made him portray the cause of effect, was yet free to express his own desires through his false standard, and thus expressed truth when it did not conflict with those desires. In the book of Job, however, we have the truest revelation from the ancients, of the human soul, its penalties and its rewards, its moving cause and the effects. The philosophy reveals to us the great principles of action, and it presents fewer religious tenets. It comes from the heart stirred with its wants and aspirations, and from the questioning intellect that would not be satisfied. Therefore it will, through all time, be the delight of those who would learn of the power that has bent, and will forever bend, the entire man to the attainment of his needs.

Most of the philosophies that center round a religious faith that has been received from the past, will be found to be sectarian, not general. We study them as connected with particular doctrines. When, however, we leave the nation that trusted reliantly to sacred revelation, we find that philosophy is centered in individuals, not in religions. It was less bound to one idea, and so because more general, less sectarian.

The Grecian philosophers were not dependent upon previous revelation, and therefore found truth in their own souls, and gave it form according to their own purity and wisdom. Their philosophy, therefore, delights the student of all ages, because the truth was not bound to its age, through that age's progress in religious faith. If the wants and requirements of the human soul are recognized, if its source and destiny are studied within itself, and not through some external revelation, then all men of all ages are instructed. But that philosophy can not be wedded to the present only in fundamental principles; for the age that gave it birth, gave it peculiarity and import to those of that age,

and the present studies it to confirm the present; not to reveal unto it.

All nations had their peculiarity of representation. If we will observe, we shall find that there is a distinct correspondence between the entire national development and its religious and philosophic. The climate, face of the country, productions, are represented in the thought that has reached us from those nations. The thought combines the entire development of the age and nation, and its individual peculiarity is also the result of that development. The wisdom of Solomon clothes itself in regal attire. The pomp of ceremony, the religious zeal, the glowing beauty of the Syrian country, combined with the crude thought of the people, reach us from every page of inspiration. The Persian records give us a similarity in all that comes from beauty of scene and climate; but we have distinctive national marks. As the altars of fire that glowed in sacred light, gave their reflex on the cloud, so we find each beauty and glory revealed in one shadow that we catch from that splendor of the past. The Hindoo found the cool retreat and the seclusion of his temple sacred to him, because he thus escaped the distraction of physical heat and the effect of caste upon him; and thus in his religion and philosophy we have the lack of universal sympathy and the mysticism of isolation.

In the Grecian philosophy, we recognize the more universal truths, and their fitness to all ages and classes. This came from the more frequent association of classes, and the general refinement of the nation. The development of the whole nation, through its love of beauty in every department, brought forth a truly spiritual philosophy, that at the present day delights the scholar and the rationalist.

But we perceive that those sects of philosophy failed to combine a pure religious element in their teachings, and that the morality accorded with the morality of the ages that produced them. There is this difference in the progress of morality and doctrines. Morality is the out-growth of the affections—doctrinal faith of the intellect; therefore, the two need not necessarily correspond. A spiritual philosophy can only result when morality and faith accord, or the intellect and affections have been wedded.

Thus we find those philosophers who taught in purity the laws of man's being, and showed his connection with his fellows, must have been advanced to a high state of moral excellence, and have possessed intellectual power sufficient to enable them to present their thought to the world. Thus presented, it could not die; for it was inspired in its influx, and divine in its revelations.

But we still learn from all these systems of philosophy that none of them satisfied the masses, because it was only the few that gathered themselves about the expounder of the truth, or extended it beyond that immediate age. It lacked what could fix the aspiration of the multitude. Take a great religious priest like Mahomet, and see how he holds a power over not only one age, but centuries. What is the control that is thus gained over the minds of men so much more potent than that of philosophy?

The affections are the ruling impulses of men, and these center to form his religious nature. The affections impel to every act of devotion—the affections incite to every prayer; then, if they be led by fear or hope, they become potent to sway the whole man. Thus any earnest man who, through his own interior life, has learned of the wants of the human soul, may so direct into one channel those desires, that they shall take the form of a religious faith, which, by the tendency of the mind to trust whatever appeals to the external life, may, through forms and ceremonies, become established as a sect, to be handed down as an inheritance, and trusted, spite of its unreasonableness; this, because the affections are satisfied through it. Philosophy appeals to the reason, through the intuitions, and therefore depends, in its reception, upon the power of the mind to see from the same point, and recognize the same truth through its own perceptions. Thus philosophers fail to influence their hearers, even when they present self-evident truths, owing to their lack of this appeal to the affections.

We find, then, that man will not be fully satisfied until both be blended, and philosophy grasp religion, and religion become one with philosophy. The affections, as they center themselves on their objects, also create in the mind an entireness and fullness that makes it demand a universal expression, and be satisfied only

as it comes into relations with what shall represent most fully that entireness. Thus it demands a God, and aspires unto it. But the reason will not thus be satisfied, and demands its basis to rest upon, and will recognize only in as far as it is governed by the affections. When it is the governing power, we have the cold philosophy that leads to materialism. Let us establish between the intellect and the affections a complete union, and we have a religious philosophy; and the affections and the intellect are satisfied therein.

Those sects in the past, either religious or philosophic, that have kept to the present day any hold upon the masses, have combined sufficiently the two to make them stand as representatives of the past, and also to find in the present a recognition of truth. The Christian religion, with its various sects and diversity of faith, is from a similar result, and proceeds, as they, from a true recognition of the wants of the human soul. As soon as the universality of God's government is recognized by the Spirit that is finite in its reach, but infinite in its aspirations, all religions will be found to be one and the same in the revelation they make of the soul's need. Their measure of truth is according to the universality of the love in each soul that receives them. When Jesus represents to the soul the divine, He becomes the life of religion; but when He is made the expounder of faith, then He is merely the founder of sects. Of all moral philosophies, that embraced in His simple code, is the most perfect; of all spiritual philosophies, that declared as His own attainment is the most satisfactory, and they will be found to include the purity and beauty of all former sects. But the present day fails to recognize His perception of truth; therefore, the Christian religion, as popularly set forth, does not satisfy the philosopher or the religious man. One claims that his reason be satisfied; the other, his affections. Jesus, as representing *the Christ*, appeals not only to the affection, but also to the understanding; and the Church that is truly the Christian Church, will not be so from the assumption of any name, or the adoption of any creed, but from a recognition of the Christ life, which Jesus more perfectly manifested than any other; for the recognition of His life can only come from attainment.

The Christian philosopher will find for that Church the consistency of reliance on principles, and of unquestioning faith, and perceive one to be from the soul's link to matter as well as to Spirit, and therefore its attempt to grasp the infinite in cause; the other to be from its affections centered in its highest aspiration.

In endeavoring to find in the past, the cause of its spiritual life and growth, we must perceive that all effects result from the same cause, manifested through differing conditions, and therefore we shall find the human Spirit ever the same in its impulses and its aspirations,—that alone differing which is expressive of those conditions. All religions and philosophies have, then, one basis,—the soul's need; and it is in vain that man attempts to live without them. One must be to his heart the fire from Heaven; the other will make his reason the altar on which to place it, and the grateful incense shall fill the earth and sky.

EXISTING SOCIETY.—Clergymen, moralists, editors, and other leaders of the public mind, in laboring for the improvement of the condition of mankind, are, by the course which they too generally pursue, unconsciously contributing to the perpetuation of a general system of things, from which must necessarily flow, to a greater or less extent, the various inequalities, vices and miseries, which all now deplore. Many of them do not seem to entertain a thought that a radical change in the whole social system is necessary, but all their ethical teachings are aimed at the improvement and elevation of man upon the system of things that now prevails. Such is the tendency of most of our current and so-called *moral* literature. The effect is to reconcile superficial minds with the principles of the existing social state, and to induce the employment of mere palliatives and anodynes, for a deeply-rooted internal disease. Would that our moral and political physicians would grow sufficiently wise to know that the disease can never be cured short of a thorough renovation of the whole system!

W. F.

LIVING FAITH.

"Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, shall He not much more clothe you, O ye of little worth?"—*Matt. 6 chap. 30 verse.*

MAN'S excuse for violating the claims of justice, and disregarding the authority of truth, is that he has certain needs which must be provided for, first of all, and when such provision is made, then he will be ready to do right. When invited to the heavenly feast, to partake of the joys which flow from the union of truth and love in the soul, he has lands to be attended to, oxen to be proved, and a wife to be provided for, and therefore must be excused. He has no faith in the promise that if he seeks first the kingdom of heaven and its righteousness, all these things will be added thereto.

This lack of faith is everywhere apparent in the commercial, civil, social and religious world. The constant activity of every class demonstrates that whatever else man possesses, he has no faith in God. He reposes no confidence in the power of goodness, truth and justice. That, although the Divine Government has made abundant provision for the lilies of the field and the birds of the air, yet it has failed to make provision for that being who is of more importance than them all.

This will lead us to inquire into the nature and needs of man, who, according to his faith, is thus thrown upon his own resources, and compelled to sacrifice the needs of his higher nature to supply the demands of his lower, thus forming an exception to that otherwise fixed law, under the Divine Government, which causes the lower to subserve, with its life even, the demands and needs of the higher nature.

Man's spiritual nature demands truth in all its various degrees of manifestation, combined with pure and holy love to develop

and build it up, and thus qualify it to enjoy its heavenly birth-right. And this it can acquire only as it shall receive it into its affections, and cherish it more dearly than its own life even. Truth, whenever found, in whatever plane of existence, is a manifestation of the Divine Father's wisdom and love, and bespeaks the present God ready to elevate the soul and lead it toward its highest good and destiny; and man, indifferent to all such manifestations, is indifferent to the present God, and lacks that faith necessary to salvation.

When man, disregarding the needs of his immortal nature, pouring contempt upon the wisdom and love of the Divine Father, by rejecting the claims of truth and justice, upon the plea that he is under a higher necessity, a more pressing need, thus departs from the straight and narrow faith, he exhibits an utter lack of that living faith which is essential for salvation.

If it be true that the soul of man imperatively demands the utmost allegiance to all truth and justice, that it may grow up into God, then it can not be true that any other need of man demands that, under any circumstance, they should be sacrificed. That the highest and imperishable should yield to the low and perishable nature; yet the creeds and practices of men, in all their relations in Church and State, proclaim this absurdity—affirm this inconsistency in the Divine Government. They affirm that man can not be obedient to the true demands of his soul, and discharge his duties to himself and others.

Let us look at the various callings pursued by man, and the manner in which they are pursued, for a verification of the above statement.

We will first examine the principles of commercial intercourse, as exhibited in trade, which characterizes the present age.

In the commercial world, the spirit of the age is to acquire property—to make money. To accomplish this end, every device is resorted to, according to the current rules of fair dealing, to procure the transfer of property into the hands of the dealer; and a leading principle in trade is to take advantage of every circumstance by means of which the largest amount can be obtained for the least consideration. The greater the disproportion between the thing given and the thing received, the more

attractive is the business. Let any new means be discovered by which our day's labor will command a hundred times its equivalent, and the whole community will rush to engage in it, that they may acquire a hundred times more of the labor and toil of others than they have given in exchange.

When we consider that all real property is the product of labor, and that it has been produced by the sweat and toil of some body, we can not fail to perceive that this disposition to take advantage, and acquire more than an equivalent for what we give, is unjust and dishonest.

The trade of the speculator is to take the means to create a necessity, by monopolizing the article in which he deals; and when he has thus secured the control of the article, if it be one the people *must* have, he takes advantage of the necessity he has created to extort a large sum, thereby transferring to his own pocket that for which he has not rendered a fair equivalent. In this way he levies tribute upon the people, often compelling the poor to approach the point of starvation, that he may enrich himself with their hard earnings.

The trade of the speculator, both in the end sought to be accomplished and in the means by which he seeks to accomplish it, is at war with every principle of justice and truth. He can not flourish in his trade without being unfaithful to the requirements of truth and love. The very life and soul of it is to seek to appropriate to his own use that which belongs to another, and thus to disturb the scales of justice. The entire exercise of his thoughts and feelings is in the direction of fraud and injustice. Can such a one have faith in God, have faith in truth, in justice, in goodness? Can such a soul harmonize with that which is necessary to build it up unto eternal life? It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for such a one to enter into the kingdom.

But the extent of this spirit and of its influence is seen in every community. The public sentiment of the community is seen in that which it respects and honors. Its character is seen in its approbation. Notwithstanding the principles involved in speculation are fraudulent and unjust, and lead to all the evil consequences of falsehood and injustice, yet the vocation is deemed

honorable, and its success is pre-eminently so. There is no moral sentiment in Church or State violated by it. In the civil, political, social and religious circles, the successful speculator, according to the extent of his success—other things being equal—is elevated and honored. Even those who have been plundered by his principles and practices, do homage to his ill-gotten gains, while their children are crying for the bread of which he has deprived them.

The profession of merchandizing is also subject to the same objections. The mind is striving to make as great a disproportion between the cost and price of the article as possible. When there is no competition and a great necessity, there is no other limit than that of ability to purchase. Let me be understood. The profession itself is useful and necessary, and can be conducted upon just terms, and is so by some. But the desire to accumulate wealth leads the mass to be as inequitable as possible. The habit of making false statements, holding out false inducements to effect sales, is so confirmed and proverbial, that it is expected that one-half at least of what they say is not to be believed. One of the principal requisites of a good salesman, who commands the largest salary, is to be able to utter falsehoods with such smoothness and consistency as to give them the appearance of truth. It often becomes a matter of honorable boasting among them. Such practices become legitimate and respectable in the way of trade, and are not set down against the character. The effects upon the soul are deplorable. The tendency of such practices is to beget falsehood and injustice in every relation. The excuse offered for it is the necessity, that to be direct and honest in trade, according to established rules and practices, would be suicidal. They soon learn to lose faith in truth and justice, and to become confirmed in that condition of mind.

The mechanic, in striving to be up with the rest of community in acquiring property through his profession, loses sight of truth and justice. The art of slighting work so as to give it a false appearance, and cause it to command a price above its value, is a very important qualification. They soon learn to make things to *sell*, rather than to *use*, and care little for the service it may do the buyer, provided it is off their hands, and a good

price had and received therefor. This condition of mind leads the mechanic to be constantly discarding truth and justice, to be inworking falsehood and wrong into the articles he manufactures, converting even that which passes under his hands into a *material lie*.

Did you never think, when you have looked upon such work, that it was but the reflection of the false heart that made it? When you see a cheat inwrought into a fabric, that cheat came from the head and heart of the workman, and proclaimed his infidelity to truth and justice? Every such thing furnishes indubitable evidence of a lack of faith in the propriety or necessity of being good and true men; such practices deny the birthright of the soul.

The farmer, according to his opportunity, strives to be false and unjust. Give him an opportunity, and he will take advantage of man's necessities to extort from him the most exorbitant prices for every necessary of life. Remove competition, and he would starve the poor to death, while his granaries were groaning under their burden. Create a necessity, and he rejoices to be able to demand and get fifty dollars per ton for hay, three dollars per bushel for wheat, and so on, while his neighbor's cattle are dying of starvation, and his children famishing for lack of bread. He knows no other rule of justice than to take all he can get, while dire necessity compels the needy to submit to his exactions. Truth and law have no lodgment in his soul, while an extra dollar is to be obtained. He hears not the cries of the needy and perishing, while an exorbitant price is offered for his surplus products. Like all other professions, he finds an easy excuse in the consideration that others do the same.

Where is the farmer's faith in truth and justice, when he thinks it necessary and right to levy such contributions on the poor consumer? These principles and practices proclaim the selfish and unjust character of those who encourage and honor such conduct. If an individual had, according to the forms of law, stolen what is every day unjustly extorted from the poor, by these exorbitant prices, he could have been hunted down and sent to the penitentiary with the execrations of those who honor

the same principles and practices when they appear in another form.

The physician is often obliged to conceal his ignorance under the guise of hard names, and is experimenting, while the patient supposes he is skillfully administering to his needs; and doctors know things in respect to their practices, which it will not do to tell the people, if they hope to retain their confidence and obtain employment. They often know that their medicines are not needed, but to tell the patient this would cause themselves to be dismissed, and others to be employed in their stead. Dr. Jennings, who had the reputation of being a skillful physician among his numerous patients, became satisfied of the general inutility of medicine, and made the experiment. For several years he gave bread pills and the like, and succeeded admirably in curing diseases. And thus he might have continued; but feeling some conscientious scruples about thus imposing upon the credulity of the people, he confessed, and lost caste. The president of the British Medical Society, London, after enjoying the highest reputation as a man of science and medical skill for forty years, at last made his confession that in a vast majority of cases, medicines did more harm than good; and that, if there were no physicians in the world, human life would be prolonged, upon an average, ten years. I have myself enjoyed the confidence of many respectable physicians, who have affirmed the same thing. But the plea is, the people wish to be humbugged, and will be; therefore it is better to have them attended by prudent men, who will be careful not to injure them, than have them fall into the hands of quacks, who will be likely to kill them, so that, after all, falsehood is better than truth. To be direct and honest, they think, would be attended with fatal consequences.

The lawyer, from the nature of the position he occupies, is not expected to be truthful, except when it serves his and his client's cause. It being his business to take part in people's quarrels and disputes, in consideration that they pay him for his interest in their behalf; his profession is naturally a mercenary one, and consequently it can not be expected that his character and motives should differ from his profession.

It is claimed that every cause has two sides, a right and a

wrong one. This is not probably true, because both sides may be wrong, although it is certain that both can not be right. Consequently, in all controversies between men, one side or the other will be certain to be wrong on the controverted points, and the lawyer is as likely to be upon the one side as the other, and is as ready to be. The one first retaining him secures his services, be they for the right or wrong. The question is, what advantage does the law give, and how can it be applied to my client's case to give him the advantage—not what is just and right, when tried by the standard of moral truth and justice—and he will spend hours and days in the examination of authorities to sustain that which is to work wrong and injustice, during which time his thoughts and affections are engaged for falsehood and crime; and by his profession he puts himself in market to be hired to do these things for every one who can command the means to pay him for his services.

And the *means* by which the lawyer accomplishes his work for evil, are such as must do violence to every perception of truth and purity. In the dry technicalities of special pleading, the insertion or omission of a "whereas" often settles the question as to hundreds of dollars, and the lawyer delights in such opportunities of saddling costs upon the innocent party, although it costs the family thereof their bread. If the creditor has been too confiding, and not taken the necessary amount of legal testimony, although there remains no doubt of the justice of his claims, the lawyer laughs as his client is exonerated from it, by the judgment of the court or the verdict of the jury.

In the trial of causes, perjury is often resorted to to carry the case; not such perjury as the law recognizes and punishes, but such as works all the moral and social evils of legal perjury, and bespeaks as corrupt a state of the affections and perceptions. It is a part of the science of the profession to learn so to examine witnesses as to suppress everything that does not make for his client's cause; to propound such questions as will require but a partial statement of the truth to answer; to start objections with a view to exclude a full and fair statement of the facts; to be vigilant at every point to suppress such truths as will militate against his client's interests.

Who that is at all familiar with the practice of lawyers in courts of justice, has not witnessed frequent efforts to confuse and confound witnesses, especially when they are timid and bashful; trying by ingenious questioning to involve them in contradiction, for the purpose of impeaching their veracity, and destroying the influence of their testimony, descending even to low and vulgar abuse to excite them, and thus endeavor to impeach them by their manner of testifying?

Of all classes and professions of men, I have no hesitation in saying that none exhibit a more total and reckless disregard for truth and justice, than does the profession of law. There are occasional exceptions, but they are few and far between.

But the lawyer has his apology, like all other dishonest men. There is a demand for such kind of service. The attorney who would abandon his cause as soon as he had occasion to doubt its entire justice, would meet with but little encouragement in his profession. The maxim is general, in and out of the profession, that the attorney is sworn to be true to the interests of his client, and if the client can not depend upon the fidelity of the attorney to his cause, be it right or wrong, he will not employ him. Men have dishonest causes, and they must have counsel and advocates to correspond; and lawyers are expected to engage in such causes with all the zeal and earnestness of better men in better causes.

But in all this, the character of the lawyers is upon a level with the character of those who employ and sustain them. They are as moral and upright as the public sentiment requires them to be. While the character of their profession and practice is known and acknowledged to be in palpable violation of justice, truth and true love, they are honored and respected in society. They are welcomed in the highest circles of respectability and fashion; they are placed in the highest posts of honor, entrusted with the weightiest responsibilities. These practices do not interfere with their standing in the church. The lawyer may spend the week in the quibbling and scuffling of the court, tell any amount of professional falsehoods, use all his influence and eloquence to defeat the right and establish the wrong, and then on Sunday come into Church with his elongated face, make his formal prayers, and take

of the bread and the wine in commemoration of the virtues of the Man of Nazareth, and all this without even awakening a thought in his own mind or in the minds of his fellow professors, that there is any inconsistency between the profession and practice of a lawyer and the profession and practice of a Christian. What ideas of God and of Divine worship can such beings have that will thus enable them to trample upon every attribute of the Divine Being, spurn him in every manifestation of his presence, utterly reject him in everything whereby he can be made known to the perceptions and affections, and yet claim to have love for, and faith in him?

The Clergyman with all his professions of holiness and divine service has no more faith in God than the lawyer or the other professions, learned or mechanical. These teachers of religion, exhibit in bold relief their utter lack of faith in truth, justice and love. Their preaching is to them the means of supporting their animal natures, and must be conducted in reference to that end. Unite man's religion with his bread, and the tendency of the bread will be to prevail over, and give character to his religion. His teachings become subject to the laws of trade, and demand controls the supply. A religious teacher, whose dependence for his and his family's support is upon the proper adaptation of his doctrines to the demands of those from whom his supplies must come, is placed in a condition unfavorable to plain truth-telling. The needs of his physical nature are constantly admonishing him to be prudent in his administrations.

If the religious teacher hopes to continue in his vocation, he must administer according to the demands of those who employ him, and from whom his support is to come. But we have already seen that these various classes and professions in society are living in violation of the requirements of truth and justice in their daily business vocations; and if the minister is faithful, he will tell them of it, and condemn them for it; and he will not cease his labors and reproofs until a reform is effected. How can a clergyman do his duty, and preach to a community of slave-holders so as to please them while they are guilty of such oppression? What ideas of truth, justice and purity can he present and enforce, that will not strike at the very root of the chattelization of man? No man can preach truth in its simplicity, purity and

power, without either destroying the system of slavery, or rendering himself highly obnoxious to the slaveholder. Hence those who preach the Gospel to the slave-holders, must preach nothing they can not harmonize with such injustice and wrong, if they hope to continue among them. They thus become Judases, and betray their Lord and master for the silver, and with a hypocritical kiss, deliver him over to be crucified.

What kind of a Gospel can clergymen preach to a rich and fashionable congregation made up of the speculators, merchants, doctors and lawyers, whose every principle of action is opposed to the demands of justice and right? How is he to make fidelity to truth and love harmonize with their false practices? How can he carry pure and undefiled religion into their business relations without overturning and uprooting their whole system? His business is to teach them how to serve God with a living service, but that they can not do while they are serving mammon. Therefore, to suit these tastes and inclinations, he must teach them a divine service that will not require the overthrow of mammon's throne. A form of religious service must be provided that shall separate religion from the affairs of life, and make it a thing by itself; and there must be a division of time between man and God—between the service of mammon and the service of God; and although they can not serve God and mammon at the same time, they can serve them both by turns; give God one-seventh, and mammon six-sevenths of the time; and the clergymen must teach them this in spirit; and by doctrines, dogmas and arguments, must satisfy them of its truth, if he would have their approbation and support.

That these things are so can not be denied. Our present type of religion is fashionable and popular, and it is deemed to be in bad taste to neglect and despise its senseless forms. It has the approbation and support of the fashionable, the proud, the vain and supercilious; the trading, speculating and litigating portions of society. But why has it their approbation and support? Is it because it rebukes and destroys their pride, their vanity and superciliousness? Is it because it uproots and destroys falsehood, injustice and wrong? By no means. The proud and ambitious may pursue the objects of their ambition; the miser may cling

to his wealth ; the politician may practice his demagoguism ; the warrior may win renown upon the field of battle ; the slaveholder may oppress and plunder his slaves ; the speculator may levy his unjust exactions upon the poor ; the lawyer may hire to defend the wrong and defeat the right ; the mechanic may work falsehood and deception into his craft ; the farmer may take unjust advantage of the needy and perishing ; and all may nestle together in the bosom of the Church, and learn to recite creeds and catechisms, and sing and pray, and eat bread and drink wine in commemoration of the death of Jesus, and believe that his righteousness will save them all. Well may such religion and religious teachers be acceptable to a false and wicked world.

Justice consists in the union of truth and love. Truth is the perception of existence, as it is in its phenomena, laws and conditions, and love is that condition of the soul which delights in the universal harmony of truth, and which prompts the soul to obey all truth from the love of it. Hence true love, in the social and moral world, impels man to recognize his relations to his fellow man, and to recognize all the rights and duties incident to such relations, and to delight in regarding those rights and fulfilling those duties. All crime consists in the disregard of the claims of justice, and in doing violence to the principles of truth and love.

The thief is a wrong-doer in this ; he seeks to avail himself clandestinely of that which is another's, without rendering an equivalent therefor. The criminal condition of mind consists in its utter disregard of justice, its contempt of right ; the criminal act consists in giving expression to that criminal condition by doing the injustice, and depriving a fellow of that, which in truth belonged to him. The robber is a wrongdoer in this, that he seeks by force to avail himself of that which is another's, without rendering an equivalent for the same. His intention and end are the same as that of the thief, which is to be unjust and do injustice. The swindler is a wrong-doer, in that he seeks, by fraud, to obtain that which is another's without rendering an equivalent therefor. In this he intends, and does the wrong the same as the thief and robber. The counterfeiter is a wrong-doer in that he, by fraud and skill, seeks to avail himself of that

which is another's, without rendering an equivalent for the same. The gambler is a wrong-doer in that he seeks, by chance and skill, to avail himself of that which is another's, without rendering an equivalent for the same; and so on, in respect to all crimes against property. The gist of each crime is in the intent to be unjust and to do injustice; all beyond this has respect to the *means* by which that false and unjust intention shall be carried out; hence the difference between the crimes of stealing, robbing, swindling, counterfeiting, gambling, etc., is in the *manner* of accomplishing the same unjust purpose. The thief seeks to accomplish his by stealth, the robber his by force, the swindler and counterfeiter theirs by fraud; the gambler his by fraud, skill and chance, and so on. Now the moral difference between stealth, force, fraud and cunning, marks the moral difference of these crimes, which is just no difference at all. Robbing is more manly than stealing; for, while it is only equal in the unjust and criminal intent, it is less cowardly and mean; and stealing is not as low as swindling, for that adds the character of *liar* to that of *coward* and *villain*.

But why is the availing one's-self of that which belongs to another, without rendering an equivalent, criminal, and why is such an intent a criminal purpose? Simply because it shows the wrong-doer to be under the dominion of falsehood and injustice. It demonstrates that he has not a ruling regard for right, and that he utterly contemns the authority of justice. If, then, the criminality consists in the unjust intent and unjust act, wherein is the moral difference between that intention and action made criminal by statute, and the same intention and action, in its design and result, made respectable by the permission of the law and the practice of society?

If it is unjust to take advantage of man's weakness or ignorance to appropriate that which is his by the exercise of force or fraud, is it not equally unjust to take advantage of his necessities or of his ignorance to accomplish the same thing? Would not the man who would take advantage, through a legal technicality, to wrong his fellow, commit the same injustice by stealing, if it were as respectable to do so? And would not the attorney who aids him in doing it and thus becomes a party to the fraud

and injustice, aid him in stealing if stealing were respectable? And since the criminality, in a moral point of view, consists in the *injustice* of the mind and act, in the *moral* aspect of the case, there is no difference in the criminality of the thief, the robber, the swindler, the counterfeiter, the speculator, the merchant, the farmer, the mechanic, the lawyer, the doctor, the clergyman, or any other individual or profession, who seek by any means to possess themselves of that which is another's without rendering a fair equivalent. If any one supposes there is, let him attempt to define the difference, and he will find that it has respect to the *manner* of committing the wrong, and not to the *matter* of the wrong itself.

The truth is, that the difference between criminality and respectability, according to the popular standard, is more a matter of *form* than *substance*, and depends more upon legal license and permission than upon *moral* difference. It does not trouble the conscience of the most pious and saintly to take the advantage of his neighbor's misfortunes, to purchase his property at a mere nominal price, when the law has seized it, and put it up to public sale. He stops not to inquire how much wrong and injustice he is doing that neighbor; he feels himself under no obligation to pay a fair equivalent for his property, because, according to legal permission, he can attain it without.

Since these things are so, how shall we estimate the amount of faith men have in truth, purity and love, as manifestations of the Divine Father's wisdom, will and character? How shall we estimate the value of that religious faith and practice, which disturbs not the consciences of those who are thus false and unjust, even while engaged in their highest devotional exercises, from those who profess to meet and worship God at the meeting-house, but exclude him from their places of business? A little observation and reflection will satisfy any thinking mind that it will take a peculiar religion and a peculiar priesthood to meet the approbation of such a people. If the priest insist upon anything beyond creeds, ceremonies and forms, he will be obliged to seek his bread somewhere else; and this he understands, and has little faith in that saying of Jesus, "Seek first the kingdom of heaven and its righteousness, and all these things shall be added thereto." It is

good theoretical doctrine; but as for practice, he says, "I pray thee have me excused."

I am aware of the feeling with which these things will be received. They will be admitted to be true in the abstract, but utterly inadequate in practice. This is the very point I wished to present, "O ye of little faith." It is the doctrine of man that truth and justice are not practicable; that duties to self and family require that they be discarded when they interfere with selfish interest and selfish desire. They do not believe that God, who clothes the lilies and feeds the birds, and supplies every true and just demand in every other department of existence, has extended that same provident care to man. In short, in respect to themselves they have no faith in God. When truth and justice require sacrifice on their part, they are impracticable. Where then do we stand? Shall justice be sacrificed and truth be abandoned? If not, where shall the standard be elevated, and where shall the line of demarkation between popular and unpopular injustice and falsehood be drawn? And how far shall we feel ourselves obliged to be just and true, although it cost a right eye? Many a one has said, "Lord, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest, but first suffer me to do this and to do that." But when informed that the work of the true soul admits of no excuse, of no delay, they have not courage to carry out the high resolve. Having put the hand to the plow, they turn back, and prove themselves unfit for the kingdom of heaven. When bidden to the feast of truth wedded to love, one has purchased a farm or cattle, or has married a wife, etc., and has other interests and duties to attend to, and must be excused. Is there a God of truth and justice, and purity and love, and does man possess an immortal spirit demanding it to know truth, obey justice, be pure and dwell in love? Answer yea or nay to your soul. If so, where is your faith in God? If not, away with your hope, away with religion; eat and drink, for to-morrow ye die.

But ye say there is a God, and that ye have faith and confidence in him; that he will do all things well, and bring you to heaven and happiness at last. But how is the soul ever to know God, and find that heaven and happiness of its promise? The

Divine Father can only be manifest to the soul in its perceptions of truth and its affections for justice, purity and love. For every truth is but a manifestation of God, and every pure affection is but the inbreathing of divine love into that plane of conscious perception, and every principle of justice and right is but the harmonious blending of God's truth and love. Then how can the soul dwelling in falsehood and injustice ever know God, and come into the joys of heaven? What is the value of that faith and trust in God, which does not work by love and purify the heart? which does not cause the soul to bow to the authority of truth and justice, let what will oppose? Is not the life more than meat, and the body more than raiment? The sublimity of that faith in truth and justice, which conquers selfishness, and raises the individual above the power of falsehood and injustice, and makes him the self-sacrificing champion of right, has ever challenged the highest admiration of the soul. Such courage raises the moral hero immeasurably above all competition in the plane of animal courage. It proclaims his fidelity to man and God, while he pursues his way to the divine abode.

A true faith in the divine Father consists not in creeds, catechisms and formularies; it has little to do with the controversies about the inspiration of books of olden or modern times, or of the measure of inspiration given to Moses, David or Isaiah, to Peter, John or Paul; it has no trouble about the miraculous conception of Jesus, or the literal resurrection of his body. There are truths and duties of to-day, concerning himself and his brother, which demand his personal attention, and with which his and the world's destiny are more intimately connected, than with the destruction of the world by a flood four thousand and two hundred years ago, or with the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah in the days of Lot, or the swallowing of Jonah by a whale.

The discussion of such questions neither enlightens his head nor improves his heart; and while he is delving in the ruins of Nineveh or Babylon to find some evidence to confirm his faith in the verity of the old records, slavery and war, avarice, intemperance and lust are filling the world with wretchedness and death.

The true soul who has a living faith in a present God, can find but little time for such fruitless toil—fruitless so far as the elevation and redemption of man is concerned. He hears the cry of the needy and perishing upon his right hand and left, and he must go to their relief. The wailings of the down-trodden are in his ears, and demand immediate attention; the outcast and abandoned are in the street, and he must take them by the hand and lead them home. He sees in the Man of Nazareth a model of faith—meek, gentle, holy and undefiled—a faith in truth, in purity and love, that raised him above the temptations of appetite, passion and lust—a faith that led him to seek out the poor and needy, the outcast and despised, and administer to their needs. His was a living faith, and one by which he lived. He sought first the kingdom of God and its righteousness, not doubting that all needful things would be added thereto. Taking Jesus, then, as an illustration of a living practical faith, in what does such a faith consist?

1. In overcoming all selfishness. This life is but a prelude to an eternal one, and the things of this life should be made subservient to the higher and better one. Then why need we toil and wear out our energies of body and mind, to lay up earthly treasures at the expense of our higher needs? At best we are but weak and ignorant, and have nothing but what we receive. Why should we not feel our ignorance and dependence? Why should we be selfish and boastful?

In the second place, he subdued every lust. The purity of the divine character could not harmonize with impure desires; and as it is the highest destiny of the soul to be begotten into the divine image, a living faith could do no less than to utterly destroy the first buddings of impure desires.

In the third place, he overcame all unkindness of feeling toward those who sought his injury and destruction. The perfect and absolute love of God forbade that he should be a respecter of persons; therefore all feelings of malice, hatred, envy, ill-will and the like, are incompatible with the perfections of divine love; and a living faith will destroy them as unworthy a place in the soul of one who is to be born into the divine image.

As the perfect truth and love of the Father combine to estab-

lish perfect justice in the soul, the claims of justice can never be disregarded by him who has a living faith. Rather than be unjust, the true soul will submit to the loss of reputation, wealth friends, and even life itself, calmly reposing in the power of truth and love to work out his salvation. Said Jesus, if any man love father or mother, son or daughter, yea, or his own life better than me (meaning the truths he taught and lived out), he can not be my disciple.

Thus we have seen that to be untrue, unjust or impure in our thoughts, feelings and actions, demonstrates that we have no abiding faith in God; and that, whenever we find within ourselves an inclination to violate the principles of justice as determined by the standard of perfect truth and love, we should feel the just rebuke of the Man of Nazareth, "O ye of little faith!"

UNITY.

THERE is a mighty Oneness to my eyes,
 In all the show of earth, and sea and skies,
 And all embrace in blissful unity,
 And blend in love—and all in One agree.

In me, a part, then lives the Mighty One,
 That blends me with all things beneath the sun,
 Which to me dawns, while every rolling sphere
 His love may feel, his call to Oneness hear.

And all that is, in beauty strives to dress,
 Or with sweet music calls to its caress;
 Thus harmony and beauty are the seal
 Of the great Oneness, which I see and feel.

To thee, Great Oneness! I in meekness bow,
 And would in harmony with all things flow;
 Love then shall give me its own loveliness—
 And all my life in beauteous robes shall dress. R.

FREE AGENCY AND GOD'S FOREORDINATION.

To _____, Esq.:

Dear Sir—In compliance with your request I submit the following.
Respectfully, _____.

In the study of any religious subject there are a few primal truths that must be recognized: First, the perfection of Deity; second, his infinity; third, the limit of human attainment, and the non-acceptance of, as perfect and entire, any previous interpretation of either God, his works or his power, because of the imperfection and partiality of human attainment. We must study the present in order to interpret the past. We find in the geologic formations the harmony of the earth's development, from its lowest condition up to the present. In this study we are not merely the interpreters of the past, but of the future, for we must see that law is not an external enactment, but the expression of an internal cause, and therefore invariable. It was the recognition of this that made man trust Deity as without variableness or shadow of turning. This law can not be dependent on time; its harmony of results is not for yesterday or to-day, but forever. The *expression* of law alone depends upon conditions; those conditions have been the result of law.

We can see, then, the sure progress of all things in the past that relates to mere matter, so called. But matter is what? "The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof." Is there anything outside of God? What is the life or attraction of the mineral, but the expression on its plane of the infinite love? The plant grows, but why? Is not God the life of it? We are here, by no means, endeavoring to make Pantheism apparent, but to set forth the sublime truth that all things are included in the Infinite, for less than all would make the finite. If, then, the material can show us beauty, order, law, shall we fail to recog-

nize the sure law on the higher, spiritual plane, or in the progress of mind, from the low and beastly up to the divine?

This law of progression makes apparent the divine government; that is, it expresses the entire harmony of all things, and presents Deity as the mover and actor. We can not fail to see, then, that if the worlds revolve, the suns shine, the plants grow by a law of divine life, that it must still be the mover of man's purposes and designs. Man's *election*, then, is as the election of the little plant for its humble life in the fields. Yesterday we found it in perfection; to-day its life has become a higher life—its destiny is yet to be accomplished; for its perfume may have become a part of the human spirit; its magnetic and electric life may have gone to form the sphere of undeveloped life, and its grosser particles to combine with their attractions. Its law is *onward*; its free agency is by the law of its being. It was a humble plant, not an oak, because of the conditions that developed its individuality.

We find man an expresser of inharmony to us, because we fail to recognize his position in the scale of being. The ultimate of all material forms, we see him as a subject, and yet the sub-jector. We know that he wills and accomplishes, but we pause not to see *why* he wills.

There lives by my door a humble man. He has lived longer on earth than I; he has had the same local advantages that I have, and yet he has little moral sense—will defraud his neighbor, and apparently has no love of God in his soul. I could not do his deeds; but why? from merit? Let us see. His inheritance was a low animal nature, his development has been ever on the animal plane. We must go back to his parentage to find the cause of his inherited propensities; we must go to society, to classes, for the responsibility of his development. How, then, is he a free agent? Why does he *will* to do evil, while I strive to well? Most surely there is something back of his *will*. Is it not his condition? He could be no other than he is, because he followed in the law of generation, birth and subsequent development, "the perfect law of the Lord."

His *election*, then, is by the harmony of that infinite law that includes all matter and all spirit. His *action* must result from

condition; it is inevitable. What shall change it? Nothing but condition, and that must result from new relations. Here, then, we find that his freedom to do ill is as my freedom to do well—both are by the law of our condition. Now Deity being the all-comprehending, can not be foreign to this condition. He must be the governing power, of which the law is the expression, and the being and action the revelation.

The doctrine of free agency, then, must be lost here, as far as considered a power of the individual *to be*, but not as considered his *action of being*. His freedom is the result of his being; that is, he does what is consistent with his being, and he does that without compulsion, and as an effect of a cause. But for his *being* he is not responsible; he is a doer of the divine law as much as the holiest of human beings, because he proves the perfection of order, and shows the certain effect of cause. There is nothing here inconsistent with divine government, but everything to substantiate it. The sublime truth of infinite progression—of the perfect result of all things through the included infinity of all—makes man at once the representation of Deity, and the worker of his designs.

The *foreknowledge* of God can only be expressed to us, through our foreknowledge of any effect from certain causes. You are a horticulturist, and you know that if you engraft a fair fruit on a crab, that it will improve the quality of the fruit to be borne by the crab; but you are not thus the establisher of anything but a condition. You do not make your knowledge the inevitable result, but you make the condition bring forth the result. Knowledge is not the producer of any effect, but law has become knowledge; you know, because of the law. Deity being the all-comprehensive, and law the effect of his infinite perfection, and by his existence or being, we must ascribe to him what, in our limited idea, we term foreknowledge; but that knowledge is not as our knowledge, through finite relations, of infinite government. We limit Deity according to our limited conceptions, and measure his attributes by our own. To us knowledge is not yet the light that revealeth the beauty of all objects, but it is as a gleam in the darkness—a hope and promise.

If we did not possess foreknowledge in degree, we could not

conceive of that attribute of Deity, but we do not make it the creator of destinies, but we understand through it the law of being. For instance, any step we take in reference to a future, we do through this limited foreknowledge or finite recognition of infinite law. But with us the knowledge must always be confined to our own recognition, or the power of our minds to recognize causes in effects. For instance, you will to-morrow perhaps have your fields prepared for the opening spring. Why? Because you know that by the law that governs the earth's course and position, it will by-and-by be fitted for the seed, and this foreknowledge makes you act to-day in reference to to-morrow; but you do not thus create any law—you only recognize it.

We would not here fail to touch upon man's responsibility, which would seem to be destroyed by the condition of his being. Did we fail to recognize man's capacity and destiny, through the certain progress of all, from lowest unto highest, we might pause at this point and say, there is nothing for us to do, our fate lies in the hands of law and we are its creatures. But that law being one of progress, then, as surely as man perceives that he is not at the height of his possible attainment, that he does not express in himself his highest conception, so surely must he make his condition the only means of attainment unto that to which he reaches. As soon as he limits this progress, then does he limit the Infinite, and make His being but the imperfect.

The progress of all mind through its attributes and its affections, as of matter through its attractions, must consist in the relations in which it exists. Those relations are capable of change, and may be made harmonious and the producers of harmony. Then if man is not, he must feel within himself the power of becoming his highest aspiration. There is ever this law of progress to aid him to the attainment. He recognizes the possibility of his soul through the divinity within him—by the light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world. No man can lack this gleam of light, no one but must express a measure of the Divine; to become a revelator of the light, the manifestation of the Divinity, is the highest conception one can have of individual perfection. This aspiration is the voice of God calling unto him. His responsibility lies not in his condition but in his aspiration.

He must feel it in some degree, and his obedience to the call becomes his happiness, his disobedience his misery.

The conscience, so called, is the measurement of his obedience or disobedience to this voice. Whatever need one feels in his soul of highest good, whatever reaching forward unto the unattained is the prophecy of his future. All that retards this progress will be to him the evil that he will mourn in proportion as he feels his inefficiency.

Thus does the love and wisdom of the universe make beauty and order of all manifestations, and present unto the soul the ever to be attained perfection, which is its Heaven and its God, its trust in which makes it know itself chosen of God, its lack of the attainment of which makes its penalty and suffering, as well as its aspiration and its hope.

GOD IS THE FATHER OF MEN.—It would seem that this ought to pass as a *first* truth—a self-evident proposition. Both in the processes of creation and the consciousness of man are traces or evidences of this statement. The admission of this truth suggests another of like importance: *men are brothers to each other*. If God is the Father of mankind, then a common origin proves a common relation. As a balancing truth—one that will complete the triangle, and make up nearly the sum total of all the principles that directly move men to action and duty, may be set down the following: *progress is the destiny of man*. Here, then, we have the whole; God the Father, Man the Brother, and Progress the Destiny. Let man feel that God is his Father, and he will naturally be drawn to him; let him feel that man is his brother, and co-operation and mutual relation will be the consequence; let man feel that every excellence of character he may acquire, every attainment he may make, will be retained, and be an instrument for higher, greater attainments, and he will possess the highest stimulus to virtuous action. This is a saving truth to him. Reader, these are suggestions upon which you may reflect with profit.

Z. B.

SELF-ACCUSATION.

"I will arise and go unto my father, and say, Father, I have sinned, and am no more worthy to be called thy son."

WE may reason as we will upon man's connection with all matter, and thus that he is the effect of cause, a link in the unending chain, we yet find in his personality and individuality the responsibility that gives him this consciousness of what he terms sin. Each one feels it, because it is the result of personality, but the degree depends upon his individuality. It is the first development of that personality, and is a proof of man's advance beyond mere individuality. When he begins to define this consciousness, he makes it either a stimulant to reform or to self-gratification. But consciousness cannot help him, only as it is a stimulant. Self-accusation never reformed a man. Indeed, it tends to take away his self-hood, unless it is followed by a search into the cause of the condemnation, or by a quickening of the perceptions, so that they instinctively avoid the cause. There are many who waste their strength by this contest with themselves, when such an examination would satisfy them of the producing cause, and thus it might be removed. If we term that sin, which thus stands as a barrier to man's happiness, we must define it. Sin can not be talked about, reasoned upon as an existing thing. It is no creation. If we place it outside of man, then he is not the producer of it. If we remove the cause outside of himself, then he is not responsible. It is evidently interior. When one speaks of being a sinner let him define his meaning, and he will resolve it to this, that he is dissatisfied with himself because he is not what he would be. There is a consciousness that is not merely his consciousness of self, but of that beyond self, or of what he has not yet attained. If it were not so, he could not know the dissatisfaction. He must have within himself this consciousness of

attainment. Leave a man to follow out his instincts irrespective of others, and he would soon, by experience, judge of what gave him pleasure or pain, and would act accordingly; but he can not escape the influence of others, and, therefore, he soon begins to measure himself from without himself, and establishes a false standard. His acts then, are not the representatives of his individuality, and his consciousness is not necessarily, from his own repulsion of them, but from his measure of them. In this case accusation is no means of progress, but only of conformity. "I will be what my neighbor is. I will represent myself by my neighbors standard." This is the conscience of the world.

But notwithstanding all this, there is yet a *self*-consciousness, for it is intuitional and can not be escaped—a self-accusation. We have said that it was the result of man's consciousness of that unto which he had not yet attained, and was by the law of his progress. It must have, then, for its end man's advancement. A person is ill, and he suffers pain. What is the effect upon him? To seek relief. This he does by remedy, or by mental effort, endeavoring to throw his thought into another channel. If he yield himself to the instincts of his body, he will very likely become his own physician, and heal himself. What pain is to the body, that is sin to the mind. There is some derangement of the functions that will not let man rest without suffering. We may say that his body is not in harmony; that he has violated the laws of his being, but it is quite as well to say he is sick. So we may say of man's short-comings, he has violated his higher nature, he is not in harmony; but it is as well to say he has sinned. The effect of one is pain; of the other, self-accusation.

It matters not if he say, "It is not I, but another;" he *knows* that he can not escape the penalty. Then it is personal; it has to do with one's self, and not with another. Now let one find how much of his self-accusation comes from his own personal dissatisfaction, and how much is the result of some other one's personality, and he can readily find how much is a healthy call of nature, asserting her self-hood, and crying "come up hither," and how much is from the setons and tortures of the spiritual pharmacy.

There is no doctrine of Christianity found in the teachings of Jesus more evident than this, that conviction of sin is intuitional. That it is not from precept or command, but is from the consciousness. Therefore, the exhortation was always in reference to condition. A condition was to be reached, and conviction was the first recognition of it; for, until there was the knowledge of something to be attained, there could not be even the desire for attainment. But this conviction, or self accusation, did not point out the way. It never resulted in good, only as has been stated, in showing what was to be gained, and what had not been. It is the higher office of aspiration to lead the soul, and that aspiration must not be, to be freed from the terrors of sin, but to attain unto holiness.

We find that professed teachers of morality and religion act upon the minds of their pupils in various ways. Fear is believed to produce the required conviction, and therefore the terrors of the law are set forth; but another means, more satisfactory and pleasing, is to hold up a pattern by which the soul is to be shaped. "Fit your soul to this mould, it is perfect, devised and formed for you; do not look farther"—as your boot-maker would fit your foot to his boot, and one begins to feel really that no one else has such a pattern. But if he go a step farther, not farther than the next vendor, he will find another pattern, and quite as likely to suit. Wait a few years, and he will find that all the fashions have passed away, and there is another device. This is not the *religion* of the teachers, *that* lies quite beyond, and is the governing power that retains all this influence upon the popular mind; but it is the attempt to set up a standard outside of the soul, and is to religion what clothing is to the body. Religious reform can not advance until men perceive that no external measurement will serve. Neither fear or favor avail; neither condemnation or justification, but only the effort to attain that which is recognized as the possible condition of the soul.

It is as weak and childish as the muling of the child to be always fretting at one's condition. Repentance does not come thus. "Do works mete for repentance;" and as all works that are really works, are the spontaneous outgrowths of the life, the works will always judge the condition, as the fruit the tree. No

one who has revealed unto himself by his aspirations his possible future, can be otherwise than humble, but he can not be abject. This consciousness of his capacity must make him esteem himself one of the sons of God, and therefore make him a man. As such he has no right to lie in the dust to eat with the swine. "I will arise and go unto my father," prefaced the words "I have sinned."

L. M. W.

SEEKING GOD.

MORAVIAN HYMN.

THOU hidden love of God, whose hight,
Whose depth unfathomed no man knows;
I see from far thy beauteous light,
Inly I sigh for Thy repose.
My heart is pained, nor can it be
At rest till it find rest in Thee.

Thy secret voice invites me still
The sweetness of thy yoke to prove;
And fain I would; but though my will
Seem fixed, yet wide my passions rove;
I aim at Thee, yet from Thee stray.

'Tis mercy all, that Thou hast brought
My mind to seek her peace in Thee;
Yet while I seek but find thee not,
No peace my wandering soul shall see.
O, when shall all my wanderings end,
And all my steps to Thee-ward tend?

Is there a thing beneath the sun,
That strives with Thee my heart to share?
Ah! tear it thence, and reign alone,
The Lord of every motion there!
Then shall my heart from earth be free,
When it hath found repose in Thee.

THE KNOWLEDGE OF SPIRITS AND THEIR PROGRESS.

We have heretofore noticed some of the laws of Spirits and found that it is by affinities that they associate, and that those affinities are the result of the ruling loves. Hence it will be perceived that the knowledge of Spirits must be limited. By that is not meant that their knowledge is limited when compared with their knowledge while inhabitants of the earth, but that it is limited as respects the various conditions of Spirit in the spiritual world, as well as in respect to general principles. In the spiritual world they can not perceive truths beyond their spheres of development, nor can they know them within their sphere, unless they are properly presented. They can perceive spiritual facts or phenomena, as we perceive physical facts or phenomena; but it does not thence follow that they can understand the nature of those physical phenomena which we behold. And furthermore, it is to be known that Spirits of the higher spheres, can not perceive the real character of the lower spheres, unless they have been in the ruling loves of those spheres. Highly developed Spirits can perceive that undeveloped Spirits have not love toward their neighbor or love toward God. They can perceive that they delight in the false and evil.

But it is otherwise with Spirits who have been under the ruling love of those low spheres, and have developed to higher ones. They can perceive the real condition of those in the several spheres through which they have passed, and in the loves of which they have been. Thus it will be perceived that such Spirits have more wisdom in respect to those spheres, than higher Spirits who have never been in such loves; and from hence can be perceived the meaning of Christ's saying "The children of this world are, in their generation, wiser than the children of light."

That this is so, can be learned from the experience of this life. The trials, temptations and sufferings of this life, can only be truly known, except to those who have experienced them. The pains of body and mind which the poor drunkard suffers, can only be known to those who have experienced them; the utter wretchedness and agony of despair, can only be known to those who have witnessed the last ray of hope expire.

From hence it will be perceived that those who have never been in the loves of the lower spheres, do not know the real conditions of the Spirits of those spheres; thus it is that Spirits of the same spheres have different opinions respecting the conditions of those in lower spheres. Take two Spirits of the same sphere, one of which entered it by development from the lower spheres, the other of which entered it at once after leaving the body, and they would be likely to entertain and give different opinions as to the condition of the Spirits of those lower spheres. Each would answer from his own experience. It is thus that Spirits sometimes tell us that certain conditions may exist in that world, but they have never perceived any such.

It has been supposed by some that Spirits on entering the Spirit-world, entered their true sphere at once; but this is not the case. Those who have lived a hypocritical life through external restraints, and who have cherished desires they feared to act out, lest it should injure their character and standing in society, or lest it should injure their business prospects, for a time are under restraint, and endeavor to wear their hypocritical masks after they enter the Spirit-world; but when they perceive that their real character is known and can not be hid, they drop the mask, and abandon themselves to their delights.

There is another class, whose ruling loves are so diverse and balanced, who are of so light and evanescent a character, that they can not at once determine their sphere, and in this condition they wander about, and are for sometime unlocated.

There is still another class who do not at once enter their true sphere. These are they who are strongly developed in their animal and intellectual nature, without love to their neighbor. They are such as are under strong animal love, and at the same time

the love of science and philosophy. When these loves are nearly balanced, it is not at once determined which will prevail or become the ruling love. Any combination of character, when the different loves give rise to different affinities which are nearly balanced, will tend to defer the period when the Spirit will enter upon its true sphere.

Again: a Spirit may be in a peculiar condition of mind at the time of entering the Spirit-world, which may be only temporary in its character, that is, may last but for a few hours or a few days. He may have entered under the influence of intense excitement, like that of anger, fear, horror, etc., or under the influence of grief, remorse, despair, etc., when the loves are overcome and the affinities suppressed, by the temporary condition of mind. From hence it will be perceived that Spirits do not at once enter upon their true sphere unless their ruling loves are in the ascendant at the time of entering the Spirit spheres.

It has been said that the duration of character in the Spirit-world depended upon circumstances. Some of these circumstances will be set forth in what follows. Character depends upon the ruling loves, and the ruling loves are strengthened or weakened by exercise or want of exercise; exercise depends upon means of gratification; a want of means destroys exercise and eventually causes the love to perish.

When Spirits enter the Spirit spheres under the dominion of the animal loves, or the love of science, they are attracted to this world by their affinities, and seek a continuance of gratification. For Spirits, being divested of animal bodies, have not within themselves the means of gratifying their animal loves, and hence must seek to come into sympathetic relation with minds yet in the body.

That disembodied Spirits can come into sympathetic relations with those in the body, is known from many considerations. For Spirits can not impress thoughts or feelings upon minds from which they are repelled by opposite affinities. Hence, when a Spirit seeks to impress a mind in the body, such Spirit must come into the affinity of that mind. But if the mind be already in the ruling love of the Spirit, or if the loves of the mind be dormant,

and consequently the affinities be absent, then the Spirit can come in contact with such mind, and impress it.

But a Spirit of a higher sphere can not come in contact with one in a lower sphere, while its ruling loves are active and its affinities stronger. It must generally, therefore, employ agencies within such lower spheres to do its work there. But at times the ruling loves are not active, and then higher Spirits can approach directly the minds of those in lower spheres, and in the body.

The reason why Spirits of higher spheres can not come into sympathetic relation to minds in the lower spheres and in the body, while their ruling loves are active, is because when they are in sympathetic relation with such mind, they must partake of its loves, and thus bring about antagonism or repulsion within themselves, and if the love of the evil and the false should be the strongest, it would overcome the love of good.

That this is so, can be known in this life from experience. The sympathetic relation which is established between the magnetizer and his subject, enables the magnetizer to control the thoughts, feelings and affections, and even the sensations of his subject, so that he can, by a mental condition of his own, cause his subject to feel sensations of pleasure or pain, emotions of joy or sorrow; and when the sympathy between them is mutual, the magnetizer himself experiences the sensations and emotions of the subject. I have not unfrequently experienced myself the effects produced through this sympathetic relation, where the subject is made to feel hot or cold, to taste water, wine, brandy, lemonade, sugar, tobacco, etc., at the will of the operator.

From this it will be perceived that Spirits governed by the loves of the animal nature, can gratify those loves by coming into sympathetic relation with those in the body who are under the same loves, and are in the practice of gratifying them. Hence those Spirits who are under the ruling loves of the drunkard, the libertine, the sportsman, the gambler, the jockey, etc., will be attracted to the dram-shops, the brothels, the chase, the gaming-houses, and the horse-races, partaking of their accustomed enjoyments through sympathy.

And hence it will be perceived that these Spirits are seeking

opportunities to come into sympathetic relation with minds in the body, that they may provoke in them desires leading them to seek such gratification. Those in the body who are under such influences, are those who experience, on a sudden, strong impulses to do particular acts before unthought of, or to gratify particular appetites or passions. It is thus that minds in the body are tempted by Spirits, and it is thus that minds in the body become tempters of the Spirit, by being under the dominion of their animal loves, and thus furnishing them facilities for such animal gratification.

We may thus understand how the condition of minds in the body becomes a means of tempting Spirits, and exercising them in their ruling loves, and thereby preventing their progressive development. So long as there are dram-shops and alcoholic drinks, those Spirits under such ruling loves will attend to them; so long as there are brothels and libertines, Spirits under such ruling loves will be attending upon them; so long as there are race-courses and horse-races, Spirits under such ruling loves will be devoted to them, etc.

Thus it will be perceived that the condition of society in this world will determine the duration of the character of those who are under the animal loves in the spiritual world; for this world is to the Spirit-world as the animal body is to the Spirit, and the three worlds are to each other as the animal, the spiritual, the celestial in man; thus it is that man is a microcosm of the universe, and the universe is a macrocosm of man, and that man must learn to know himself if he would know God, and that man is in the "image of God;" and again, "Is it not written in your law, I said ye are gods."

Then it is evident that, while the Spirit is under the dominion of the animal nature, and the means of gratification are open to it in this world, it can not be brought into the higher spheres, any more than the drunkard can be reformed in the midst of dram-shops, or the libertine in the midst of brothels, or the jockey in the midst of race-courses. Therefore as the world is reformed, the prospect of the redemption of these lower spheres is increased, and hence it is the labor of higher spheres to reform the condition of society in this world; and it is said by Christ, "the angels in

heaven rejoice over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons, that need no repentance."

From the foregoing, it will be manifest that the lower spheres in the Spirit-world are affected by the character of society in this world; that the relation of this world to the Spirit-sphere is similar to the relation of the animal body to the mind. Taken together, they mutually act and re-act upon each other, as the mind acts upon the body, and the body upon the mind, and they come under the influence before described; love begets activity, and activity strengthens love.

Now until the world shall be redeemed from the false and depraved state of society, which begets such depravity in its members; and until men by such redemption, shall cease affording undeveloped Spirits the means of animal gratification, the Spirit under the dominion of the animal nature will not be likely to be reformed or changed. It will not be likely to approach the celestial and divine; but, on the contrary, it will recede from the divine and descend to still lower and darker spheres.

But this redemption of the world must be accomplished by bringing the loves and delights of the Spirit into harmony with the Divine. All must be brought into the "love of the Lord." This can only be done by bringing the exterior selfhood into subjection to the interior. But the exterior is to be instructed and disciplined in the way to the Divine, by being brought under the law of love to the neighbor, and thus the ruling love becomes that of charity to the neighbor. When perfected in this love, the next advance is to be brought into a new ruling love; that is, the love of good, and the Spirit comes into the love of God.

From hence it will be perceived that the highest attainment, under the law, is to be perfected in charity toward our fellow-men without coming directly into the love of God; while under the law we act from the exterior; that is, the ruling impulse is from the exterior, and not from the interior or divine; hence such activity is not spontaneous or from the Divine, and the declaration will be perceived that "the law can not make the comers thereunto perfect."

But it must be perceived that although the law can not make the comers thereunto perfect, it is nevertheless necessary for the

redemption of those who are under the dominion of the exterior nature, that is, the man of sin. For, being under the dominion of the exterior, they can not perceive the Divine, and therefore must be instructed by the law. Hence it is that the law becomes a schoolmaster, leading the exterior man in the direction of the Divine, that is, leading him through the wilderness of the exterior. But the law can go no further than to the borders of the celestial spheres; it can not enter. Like the law-giver Moses, it can not lead the host across the Jordan which separates the spiritual from the celestial spheres. Those under the law can ascend the Pisga of brotherly love, and behold the promised land, but they can not partake of the milk and honey thereof; that is, they can not know the loves and joys of the Divine.

But that law which unerringly leads the exterior man in the direction of the divine, is the law of charity toward our neighbor as revealed by Christ. Hence he is denominated the *way*, the *truth* and the *life* to those who believe in him and keep his commandments. Hence the promise of redemption from sin is only to those who believe and obey the commandments of Christ, which ultimate in loving God supremely, and our neighbor as ourself.

This law of Christ must continue as a law for the exterior man, until all things are brought into subjection to this law of love; and when all things are brought under the dominion of that law, then Christ, as the word or law of God to the exterior man, will be said to have brought all things into subjection unto himself, that is, unto the law of charity toward the neighbor; and when that is accomplished, Christ will be said to have "put down all rule, and all authority, and all power." "For he must reign until he hath put all enemies under his feet."

This triumph of the law of Christ, that is, the law of love to the neighbor, which is the highest law the exterior man can perceive, and consequently obey, will be the consummation of man's subjectivity to the externals of existence. "Then cometh the end," not the end of existence, but the end of the world, that is, the end of the ruling loves and delights of the exterior, and all will be brought into the love of the Divine. Thus it is said, that when all things are brought into subjection to Christ, that is, when all rule, authority and power are put down, then Christ himself will become subject to the Father, and "God will be all in all."

THE OFFICE OF THE LAW.

MAN in his exterior nature can not perceive the interior, and therefore can not act from it, unless there be an exterior rule requiring the same activity as that which the interior would prompt. But in obeying such rule, man acts not from an interior perception of the truth or principle which he obeys, and therefore does not act from the interior or divine, but from the exterior and imperfect. He acts not from the interior promptings, the spontaneous goings forth of the inmost, that is, he acts not from the perfect or divine.

The law is addressed to the exterior man, and becomes a "commandment unto him," independent of his interior perceptions and delights. The law is to the exterior man, what an arbitrary rule is to the student in mathematics. By a careful application of the rule, he can solve a particular problem, and thus can bring out the answer of the book; but not perceiving the principle, he must depend upon the book to know if his solution be correct or not. Such exercise will never make him a mathematician; at best he will be only a mathematical machine. He will never perceive and appreciate the beauty and proportion of the mathematical science. So it is with the law; it may direct the mechanical activity of the man, in his exterior nature, but it will never of itself, develope the interior, or make it receptive of divine truth. The law is necessarily imperfect, although it emanate from the divine; that is, it is imperfect as a rule of action when compared with the divine. To bring an individual under the law, pre-supposes that without the law, he does not perceive the propriety or fitness of its requirements, or without its mandate, he has not a pleasure of himself in obedience; that is, if left to his own pleasure he would not obey it.

Therefore, those under the law are presupposed to be ignorant of the principles requiring its enactment, and also to be in a condition of mind averse to its requirements, and that the law is necessary to guide, and its penal sanctions to compel obedience. Hence it is said that Christ came to those who were under the law, not under the Jewish law only, but under the law of the ignorant and perverse exterior, whether Jew or Gentile.

Those who are in the divine light and life are not under the law. They are divinely illuminated, and the affinities of their ruling natures spontaneously lead them in the ways of truth, righteousness, and love. They perform that which the moral law requires, not from a sense of obligation, but from an interior delight. Hence the remark of Christ: "It is my meat and my drink to do the will of my Father which is Heaven." Being in the interior delight of the divine, they are not subject to temptations, because they are free from external influences, called motives to action; such are described as being freed from the law—as being born into the liberty (freedom) of the sons of God. Hence, also, it is said that the law is for the disobedient; and also, I came not to call the righteous, but sinners, to repentance.

Thus it will be perceived that, while the law is addressed to the exterior man as a means to teach and enforce obedience to the requirements of the divine, it can not of itself bring man into the interior or divine. It can only lead him in that direction, and prepare the exterior to come into harmonic relation with the divine, in order that the door of the heart may be open to divine influx, whereby celestial or divine truths may be communicated to the inmost.

Man, under the ruling laws of the exterior, can not perceive celestial or divine truths, and therefore can not act from them. Being under the exterior, he is in bondage to motives, and can be induced to obey the requirements of truth, purity and justice, only so far as they become incorporated into the external influences which control his activity. Hence it is that, to the exterior man, law must have its sanction in the nature of a penalty; and that sanction must be such as can lay hold of the understanding of the subject. To those who are under the dominion of the animal

nature, whose activity is prompted by the passions, appetites and lusts, who can perceive no higher law than that of selfishness and force, the penalty of the law to be effective, must be addressed to that animal nature. Such were the laws of Moses addressed to the Jews. They could not perceive any higher, and therefore could not have obeyed them.

The laws of Moses, addressed to the Jews, were no more the laws of the divine, than the law of selfishness and force in the animal kingdom is the divine law, and applicable to man in a higher sphere of development; and those occupying a higher stand-point in the path of development, are no more justified in going back to the animal government of Moses, to find precedents to excuse their delinquencies to the requirements of truth, justice, purity, and love, than they would be in going back to the laws of the mere brute.

In the days of Moses, that is, in that age of the world, society was in the era of animalism, and as such, was under the dominion of selfishness and force, as the highest measure of justice it could appreciate, and hence the highest law they could understand was the bloody code of Moses, sanctioned by force. But those laws were no more expressive of the divine character, than the sensuality and lust of David or Solomon were expressive of divine purity.

Owing to the animalism of the age, the stand-point of truth, justice, purity and righteousness were exceedingly low. Hence, according to their perception of character, one who was the most righteous of the age, and who, with his family, was saved from destruction on account of his righteousness, became intoxicated, and cursed his son with a most bitter curse for not concealing that nakedness which his own drunkenness had exposed; and Lot, the righteous man of Sodom, who had not five equals in the city, offered his virgin daughters to the mob, and finally became drunken and had criminal intercourse with them; and Abraham, the father of the faithful, was an adulterer, a slaveholder, and a committer of incest; and David, "the man after God's own heart," was an adulterer, a murderer, and the keeper of a harem; and so with Solomon. These things are mentioned not to reproach or cavil, but to show the morality of the age of society in which

they lived, and the stand-point from which Moses and his cotemporaries viewed the divine character. Those men, if they were the lights of the world, were only the lights of the dark age in which they lived; if their institutions were designed to instruct and govern society, they were only suited to the dark age of animalism. It would be as proper for the present age to take their sciences, their philosophy, and their art from the patriarchal age, as to think of deriving their laws, their governments, their morals and religion from that source. Those moral examples of that age of animalism, could not keep men from the penitentiaries and gibbets of any civilized country, so far were they behind the development of the present era. Their laws and institutions might be suited to their day and generation, but they are not suited to the present; and those who are constantly holding up those institutions and practices as worthy of regard, and as being of divine authority, never go there to find that which shall sustain justice, purity, truth and virtue, but to find that which shall lend its sanction to force, injustice, and wrong. They go there to find sanctions for war, slavery, and blood. They go back to the age of animalism to forge the sword, the fetter, and the spear upon the anvil of the god of Moses—to erect the gibbet and the cross at the foot of the throne of the animal Jehovah. The despot traces his title to enslave and oppress, to those ancient God-given institutions.

We must keep in mind that everything appears to man according to the stand-point from which he views it. We measure justice, truth, purity and love according to our perception of it. Had God attempted speaking to Moses and the Prophets, it would have been necessary to have addressed them in the language of the age, and according to the capacity of those being addressed. It is, therefore, no question belonging to us whether God spake to man or not, unless we live in the Mosaic age. The language is the language of the animal Moses, and the institutions have the same paternity, whether God spake to him or not.

In that age of animalism, the divine quality of justice could not be perceived, and consequently could not be revealed to man. The things of the flesh could not perceive the things of the spirit. Justice between man and man was not perceived in any other

sense than the unenlightened savage perceives it, when he is seeking the scalp and thirsting for the blood of some innocent being, to appease the malignity of his feelings for some supposed wrong which he has suffered. Guilt became a debt which could be paid like other debts; and justice was satisfied when the debt was paid, no matter who paid it.

The divine quality of justice is that which determines the equality of relation between the subjects of it, in respect to the subject matter of just action, no matter whether those subjects of justice be man and man, or man and God. Justice must extend from one subject to another, and be constant between *them*. It depends upon *their* individual relation to each other, and not upon the relation of a third person. If I have violated the divine requirements, and thereby brought myself into unjust and antagonistic relations with the divine, that relation is between myself and the divine, and can be assumed by no other being. If justice requires remuneration, I alone am the one to make it; no one can make it for me, and thus do justice between me and my God.

The idea that justice is of so low a quality as to exist independent of the relations of one being to another, is extremely absurd. If I owe a debt, and refuse to pay it, and another pays it for me, justice has not been done. My creditor may not suffer from my injustice, but my friend does; and so far as justice is concerned, my creditor might as well have suffered as my friend. If my creditor would not have suffered without the debt, he is in no greater or better condition after the debt was paid, than he was before.

In my pecuniary transactions, I am unjust when I refuse to pay a just debt, because I have received from my creditor that for which he has received no equivalent. That lack of equivalent is what determines the unjust relation. And when my creditor receives that debt at the hands of a third person, he receives that for which the third person has received no equivalent; and hence there is between him and such person the same unjust relation which previously existed between him and myself. Is it said that such unjust relation does not exist, because the third person voluntarily paid the debt? If, then, the injustice of the relation

depends not upon the relation itself, but upon the mental condition of the parties, then the creditor, being willing to excuse the debt, had it in his power to restore just relations at pleasure ; and if it is not done, it is his fault, and nothing but selfishness would exact the penalty, when an innocent party must be made to suffer.

Divine justice knows nothing of such selfishness, nor can its claims be satisfied with such miserable sophistry. Divine justice consists in individual reciprocity—every being bearing in himself the fruit of his own activity and relationship. According to its laws, innocence can not atone for guilt. In the present age of society, the claims of justice are too well understood to sanction any such idea. Criminals can not be imprisoned and gibbeted by proxy. In this respect, human ideas of justice are more perfect than the Mosaic perception of divine justice. The civil definition is nearer the truth than the theological. But this theological idea of justice belongs not to the present age of development.

THE Church is important only as it ministers to purity of heart and life, and every Church which so ministers is a good one, no matter how, when or where it grew up ; no matter whether it worship on its knees or on its feet, or whether its ministers are ordained by pope, bishop, presbyter or people ; these are secondary things, and of no comparative moment. The Church which opens in heaven is that, and that only, in which the spirit of heaven dwells. The Church where worship rises to God's ear is that, and that only, where the soul ascends. No matter whether it be gathered in cathedral or barn ; whether it sit in silence or send up a hymn ; whether the minister speak from carefully prepared notes, or from immediate and fervent irrepressible suggestion. If God be loved, and Jesus Christ be welcomed to the soul, and his instructions be meekly and wisely heard, and the solemn purpose grow up to all duty amid all conflict, sacrifice and temptation, then the true end of the Church is answered.